24-8

129-3

17

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Princeton, N. J.

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.
BX 5133 .B5 1804 v.4
Blackburne, Francis, 1705-1787.
The works, theological and miscellaneous-- of Francis

THE

WORKS,

THEOLOGICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS,

Including some pieces not before printed,

OF

FRANCIS BLACKBURNE, M.A.

LATE RECTOR OF RICHMOND,

AND ARCHDEACON OF CLEVELAND;

With some account

OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS

OF THE AUTHOR, BY HIMSELF,

COMPLETED BY HIS SON

FRANCIS BLACKBURNE, L.L.B.

And illustrated by an Appendix of Original Papers.

IN SEVEN VOLUMES.

VOL. IV.

LIBERABIT VERITAS.

Cambridge;

PRINTED BY B. FLOWER, FOR THE EDITOR:

SOLD BY CADELL AND DAVIES, STRAND; CONDER, BUCKLERSBURY; HURST, PATERNOSTER-ROW; AND MAWMAN, POULTRY, LONDON; DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE; AND TODD, YORK.

1804.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/workstheological04blac

CONTENTS.

PAGE

CONSIDERATIONS on the present state of the Controversy between the Protestants and Papists of Great Britain and Ireland; particularly on the question how far the latter are entitled to Toleration upon Protestant Principles: being the Substance of Two Discourses delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Cleveland, in the years 1765 and 1766 - - - 1

FOUR DISCOURSES:

I. On the Duty of a Christian Minister under the obligation of conforming to a National Religion established by the Civil Powers.

II. On the Questions, What is Christianity; and, Where is it to be learned?

III. On the true Meaning of the Phrase, The Interests of Religion.

IV. On the Original Principles of the First Protestants.

Delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Cleveland, in the years 1767, 1769, 1771, and 1773 - 261

A Discourse on the Study of the Scriptures. Delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Cleveland, at the Visitation held in the year 1763 - 405

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

PRESENT STATE

OF THE

CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN THE

PROTESTANTS and PAPISTS

OF

GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND;

Particularly on the queſtion

How far the latter are entitled to TOLERATION upon PROTESTANT PRINCIPLES:

BEING

The SUBSTANCE of TWO DISCOURSES

Delivered to the

Clergy of the Archdeaconry of CLEVELAND, in the years 1765 and 1766.

[FIRST PRINTED, M,DCCLXVIII.]

TO THE

Reverend and much respected

THE

CLERGY OF THE ARCHDEACONRY

OF

CLEVELAND.

HAD not the publication of the latter of these Discourses been desired by such of you, my Reverend brethren, as met me at Thirske in the summer of 1766, I should hardly have thought of sending any part of these papers to the press. But that being otherwise determined, it was next to be considered, that the second Discourse being only the sequel to one delivered the year before, could not well appear without that introduction, which was the

more necessary, as it contained some authorities to which the latter Discourse referred, and on which several particulars in it had some dependence.

The obliging manner in which the publication of that little piece was proposed, left me no room to decline it; and, as both Discourses were drawn up without any view to their being made public, the revisal of both became necessary, which immediately suggested the propriety of a more convenient arrangement of their contents, and of throwing them into one continued Discourse; without any other alterations, however, than such as a more methodical disposition of the several parts, and the correction of the inaccuracies in the written copies, made indispensable.

As this was doing, many things occurred, very proper, as appeared to me, to illustrate as well as to confirm some particulars, which, in so short discourses, would not admit of circumstantial details; more especially such as related to the objections on the one hand, and the pleas, on the other, of certain late writers in favour of popery, whose misrepresentations of matters of fact, and sophisms in reasoning, seemed to require a more particular refutation,

than, as far as I could learn, they had then met with.

These additional matters are put into the form of notes, and may serve, I would humbly hope, to point out some circumstances in the present state of popery among us, that may deserve the particular notice of us who are more immediately concerned to warn our respective congregations against these delusive corrupters of christianity, and may not be unworthy of the regard of every dutiful and affectionate subject of our most gracious Sovereign upon the throne.

The book of which an account is given, in the first number of the *Appendix*, was put into my hands by one to whom it was privately conveyed, with what intent, I need not say; and it may be presumed, that the view there given of that book, may be of use to convince those who are but moderately versed in other particulars of our controversy with the papists, that a religion which requires the support of such mean and pitiful forgeries, and enjoins such shameful acts of idolatry, can recommend itself to none but those who are either grossly ignorant of the contents of the christian scriptures, or hold them in the utmost contempt.

The reasons for exhibiting the other pieces in the *Appendix* are explained, either by references in the *Considerations* and *Notes*, or by the remarks subjoined to them.

I most willingly take this opportunity to express the grateful sense I have of the candid reception I have always met with since my first appearance among you, and of the ready assistance you have afforded me on various occasions in the discharge of my office ; and am,

Reverend and much esteemed Brethren,

your obliged and affectionate Brother,

and humble Servant,

FR. BLACKBURNE.

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

PRESENT STATE OF THE CONTROVERSY, &c.

THE frequeat remonstrances, which have appeared in public, from time to time, in different parts of the kingdom, concerning the too successful attempts of the priests and other emissaries of the church of Rome, to pervert his Majesty's protestant subjects to that communion, gave me occasion, the last year, to recommend a particular inquiry into the state of popery within this Archdeaconry; the returns to which, by the care and attention of the reverend the clergy, were sufficiently exact and particular to shew, that such remonstrances have not been wholly groundless, and at the same time to afford occasion for some very striking and obvious remarks upon particular cases, not indeed peculiar to the places from whence they are reported in those returns, but, as we learn from other authentic accounts, common to many others in like circumstances, all over the nation.

On this consideration, it may not be unseasonable to bestow a few serious reflections on

the present state of popery in these kingdoms, tending to shew, from some remarkable incidents, that the late alarms concerning the progress and increase of this dangerous superstition have not been so chimerical as some, seemingly cool and candid, but certain injudicious, and perhaps designing, lookers-on, would have us believe;* and that this is no time to suspend our vigilance and activity in counter-working the means made use of for its propagation.

Our misfortune, for some time past, seems to have been, that while we thought ourselves and our people sufficiently secure from the open attempts of popish emissaries, by the legal provisions that are made against them, our attention has been unhappily diverted by that circumstance, from their more secret and insidious practices upon particular persons who have fallen in their way. Some of us perhaps may have expected, that they would have been restrained in these attempts, by a principle of gratitude for the lenity of our civil government in conniving at their enjoyment of their own worship, while their priests should content themselves with ministering to such only as have been born of popish parents, and educated in that communion.

But they who have entertained these expectations could not, I believe, readily find an instance in all Europe, where popery has been satisfied with a bare connivance, on any consideration. Her claims and pretensions rise

* Of this kind were some letters, which appeared some time ago in the *St. James's Chronicle*, signed *Sacerdos Rusticus*, and other essays of the same tendency, in that and other newspapers.

too high to be controuled by a principle of gratitude. A church which arrogates to herself *all power in heaven and earth*, on the one hand, and whose very existence, on the other, depends upon the pompous and conspicuous exhibition of a paganish ceremonial, will never patiently submit to be confined to a corner ; or acquiesce in any terms where her peculiar merit, VISIBILITY, is excluded from the advantages of parade and ostentation.*

If indeed scripture, reason, and common sense were to have their full influence upon the hearts and understandings of all those who profess the protestant religion, the claims and pretensions of popery would be easily seen through, and universally despised. But while such numbers of our common people are so imperfectly instructed in the principles of their religion (as we have reason to fear they are) that it may be questioned whether many of them can give any better account of them, than that they derived them from their parents, where is the wonder that such uninformed minds should be greatly overmatched by the subtlety and indefatigable perseverance of the bigoted agents of a church which sets herself up for the mother and mistress of christendom ?

* The splendid and even superb decorations of popish chapels, particularly in some of our cities and great towns, are instances of this to the purpose, where even the rod of civil correction hanging over their heads, will not prevent their triumphing in this way over the plain simplicity in places of public worship, prescribed by the principles of the protestant reformation. In some cities, it is said, the popish chapel is shewn to strangers, as one of the curiosities of the place. And I have heard of one where the door of the chapel is reported to stand open in the day time to the street, from whence there is a prospect to the altar, &c.

The current opinion of those who look no farther into religious matters than mere outward appearances, hath generally been, that the truth and excellency of religion is most likely to be found with those who are most zealous in promoting their own particular sort of it. Few of these will consider that there may be high degrees of zeal where there is not a grain of knowledge; and fewer still will be disposed to undertake an accurate and laborious inquiry into the real truth and importance of doctrines which are asserted with the utmost confidence on one hand, while they are but feebly and faintly opposed on the other.

Insinuations have been thrown out of late, as if this had been too much the case between the protestant and popish clergy in this country. It has been mentioned in some late publications, that for some years past, little attention has been paid by the clergy of the establishment to that branch of controversy, which our predecessors of the last century managed against the papists with so much assiduity, with so much honour to themselves, and advantage to the cause they espoused.*

To this it hath been answered, that "this "service to the protestant cause, having been

* — *Elevè en* ANGLETERRE *où les controverſes* ROMAINES *ſont peu ā la mode, je n'y avois jamais tournē mes etudes.* Theſe are the the words of Mr. *De la Chapelle*, miniſter at the *Hague*, in the preface to his excellent letters, in anſwer to thoſe of Father *Scheffmacher*, a jeſuit of *Straſbourgh*, publiſhed at *Amſterdam* 1737. Perhaps it might be found upon examination, that this controverſy has not been much more in faſhion, for the laſt thirty years. What the reaſons, why it has not, may have been, I pretend not to determine; but apprehend they may deſerve the conſideration of the public.

" so well performed, and being to be found in " books which are easily procured, it is sufficient to refer our people to the labours of " those excellent writers of the last generation, " whenever they are practised upon by the adversary ; and that, having the scriptures in " their hands, and being not only allowed, but " exhorted to read them, they may safely be " trusted to their own sense and judgment in " applying them to the support of their principles, against all seducers whatsoever."

But I am afraid, when the circumstances of our common people abovementioned are duly considered, together with the various occasions they may have for the assistance of their pastors in new and unforeseen cases, our referring them to their own stores and capacities, will pass for no better than a compliment to our own indolence ; a sort of civil way of getting rid of the pains and trouble of making those whose station and circumstances require it, more competent judges for themselves, than their own leisure and opportunities for examination will admit of, and who may expect this service from us, through a persuasion that our designation to the ministry requires it at our hands.

Any objection against our remissness in this particular case, will have the greater force, where there is room for it, in consideration, that of all the various sorts and sects of religion professed in the christian world, popery is that to which a good christian and a good subject may be indifferent with the least safety, whether we consider its political influence upon civil society, or its pernicious effects upon the

religious dispositions of every one concerned to work out his salvation upon the best and surest grounds.

We see little indeed of this malignant influence in our own country, where the protestant religion is established, and professed by public authority, and where roman catholics have no share either in the the civil or ecclesiastical government. In these circumstances the spirit of popery is kept down, and withdrawn from public observation, and exerts itself only in private cabals and projects to counterwork the establishment of what they call heresy, and to prepare their engines against some favourable crisis to carry their designs into execution. In the meanwhile their public demeanor is fair and candid, and has all the appearances of moderation and charity, that are necessary to persuade the unthinking multitude of the injustice of those charges that have been brought against their religion, and the unreasonableness of those legal restraints which are laid upon the professors of it.

But to form a proper judgment of the spirit and influence of Popery, it will be necessary to look into the history of those countries where it is, and has been for ages past, the established religion ; and here, besides the practice of the most abject superstition, and even of the grossest idolatry, we shall find, that whenever the civil powers have attempted to provide for the public welfare by measures or expedients in any degree unfavourable to the peculiar interests of the church, means have always been found to break the peace of the community, by some or other of those turbulent ecclesiastics,

whom the mistaken zeal of former times hath nourished by luxurious provisions, and exclusive privileges, in a state of detachment from the body politic; a set of men, who whatever might be the original design of their respective founders, have not, for many ages, been of any other use worth the mentioning, than that of strengthening the iron hand of papal authority, and thereby preventing the civil magistrate, wherever he was inclined to it, from lightening the galling yoke of ecclesiastical tyranny. And where the monkish orders are so numerous, and confessors, taken out of them, have so frequently had the consciences of sovereign princes under their direction, occasions and pretences could never be wanting to controul the most salutary counsels for public welfare, if they should interfere ever so little with the claims or prerogatives of the hierarchy.

The neighbouring kingdom of France hath perhaps made more vigorous efforts in opposition to the encroachments of the See of Rome, than any popish state in Europe: and there are instances in the French histories, where these efforts have not been altogether without success. But the same histories inform us, that any advantages of this kind gained over the church, have, for the most part, been either dearly purchased, or of no long continuance*.

* The various ſtruggles of the French patriots to eſtabliſh and ſupport the *Pragmatic Sanction*, as ſet forth by Biſhop Burnet in his *Hiſtory of the Rights of Princes in the diſpoſing of Eccleſiaſtical Benefices and Church-lands, chap.* vii. and the event of thoſe ſtruggles, ſhew this in the ſtrongeſt point of light. According to Dr. Heylin (no enemy, by the way, to eccleſiaſtical uſurpations), it was made appear to

And generally speaking, whatever abatements of the papal power have been obtained in any states and kingdoms which did not absolutely cast it off, the sovereign pontiff, having the religious orders entirely under his direction, and at his devotion, hath found the means to ballance, by obtaining ample concessions in other articles. And where he hath not succeeded by way of compromise, he hath seldom failed, by the means of the same trusty agents, to take severe vengeance, sooner or later, on those who stood in his way*.

A few instances from the history of France will be sufficient to shew, that what is here advanced is not without foundation.

From the time that the Protestant religion gained any considerable footing in France, the zealous Catholics, as they called themselves, with the princes of the House of Guise at their head, left no means untried to extirpate it. But the Hugonots, gathering strength from the accession of numbers, and the high quality of those who professed themselves of the same faith, came to be in a condition to resist the efforts of the catholic faction, oftentimes with remarkable success. The consequence of which was a succession of civil wars in the very heart of the kingdom, productive

Lewis XI. that the execution of the *Pragmatic Sanction* was a saving to France of a million of crowns annually. *History of the State of France*, p. 224.

* "I will not adopt the thought of those satyrical wits, who pretend that in point of revenge, the laity are novices in comparison of the clergy; but we have scarce seen any quarrels, between the church and the world, in which the Popes have not at last had the better in point of revenge." Bayle, Innocent xi. [F.]

of all the misery and ruin that necessarily attend events of that sort.

The greatest and wisest of the French patriots, even they who adhered no less to the established religion than the most violent of the persecutors of the Hugonots, plainly saw that not only the peace and prosperity, but the very safety and existence of the kingdom of France, depended upon granting the protestants a legal toleration for the public exercise of their religion; and to that end interposed their counsels and endeavours, as far as the complexion of the times, and the violent prejudices of their bigoted fellow-subjects would bear.*

This proposal, however, was too unfavourable to the interests, and too grating to the intolerant spirit of the church of Rome, to be admitted by the clergy, or the great men who were partly the dupes of their hypocrisy, and

* Among the foremost of these was the excellent *Michael de l' Hospital*, chancellor of France, who besides defeating the projects of introducing into that kingdom first the inquisition, and afterwards the authority of the council of Trent, the two favourite objects of the Cardinal of Lorrain, would most probably, if he could, have obtained a toleration for the protestants. [See his article in Bayle's Dictionary]. Such was his influence and estimation, that even this important point was lost in the parliament of Paris, only by three voices, and given up with great murmurings, by the minority, who maintained, upon the chancellor's principles, *qu'en matiere de telle importance, n'estoit pas la raison, qu'à l'appetit de trois voix, tout la* France *entrast en combustion.* Lettres d'*Estienne Pasquier*, vol. I. p. 196. ed. 1619. To detract from *L'Hospital's* merit in these salutary counsels, it is alledged, that he was a protestant in his heart, which indeed would not have been marvellous in a man of his piety and penetration. This however, is a circumstance of no weight in the present case, since writers of all sorts who have mentioned him, agree, that his whole conduct shewed, that he had the real good of the king and people uniformly at heart. See Davila, B. ii. and Bayle *ubi supra*.

pratly induced by their own ambitious views to foment their frantic zeal among the people. And on this foundation, namely, the pretence to secure the catholic church against the attempts of the heretical Hugonots, was formed that wicked combination called *The League*, the effects of which were, besides the horrors of an intestine war, the bloody and treacherous massacre of Paris, and the murder of two of their sovereigns.

Whether the objection of the Leaguers against Henry III, namely his favouring the Hugonots, was real or pretended, (a matter which the weak and fluctuating conduct of that unhappy prince hath rendered extremely doubtful) it is certain, that circumstance was made the colour for the opposition he met with from that bigoted faction, as well as for the justification of the monk who assassinated him both in France and at Rome.*

It was the inclination, as well as the interest, of Henry IV, who succeeded him to avoid the mistakes of his predecessor, and to make his subjects happy and prosperous upon better plans of policy, which his experience and capacity for government readily suggested to him. The first step, was to compose the religious feuds and dissensions between his popish and protestant subjects, which had been the occasion of such a series of public calamity. The catholics, so called, had the legal establishment on their side, and were, out of all comparison,

* See the Letter of the Leaguers to Pope Sixtus V. May 25, 1589, about two months before the assassination, in the *Memoires de la Ligue*, Tom. III. p. 336, and their letter to the same Pope,

the majority. But the Hugonots were nevertheless a respectable body, firm and resolute in their purposes and demands, and by no means disabled from giving trouble to their oppressors and persecutors. Henry found it necessary, in these circumstances, to sacrifice his profession of the protestant religion to humour the papists, and was in many other respects, more complaisant to the fiery zeal of his ecclesiastics, than true policy would have allowed him to be in any other situation.* To balance these advantages in the scale of popery, he granted the protestants the edict of Nantes, modified in such a manner as to keep the peace between the two parties; and in the maintenance of this wise ordinance he was ever steady and determined to the last. But this being the case, all his concessions to his furious and bigotted catholics went for nothing. This edict was represented by the clergy, and consequently considered by their devotees, as the leprous token of an heretical

immediately after it, in Bayle's Dictionary, Henry III. Rem. [R]. See likewise the Pope's speech to a congregation of Cardinals, September 11, 1589, in the IVth vol. of Lord Somers's Tracts, published in 1748, p. 201. In these writings popery speaks her native language, the language of her cordial affections and invariable principles; a language very different from what she uses when, in Great Britain, she wants to palliate a powder-plot or an Irish massacre, or to recommend herself to the powers in being for a toleration, upon the flimsy pretence, that her unlimited subjection to ecclesiastical injunctions implies the same meekness and submission to civil authority, even in heretical hands.

* "Henry the fourth," says Bishop Burnet, "having been for "many years (that which they call) an heretic, stood not so firm in "his contests, either with the Pope or his clergy, as other princes, "that had been educated in a different manner, perhaps would have "done." *History of the Rights of Princes*, &c. p. 261.

taint, which could not be discharged, but by the murderous hand of a jesuitical ruffian.*

* *Le mēme jour* (the day of *Ravilliac's* execution) *fur les plaintes portées ā la cour, par l'Archevēque d'Aix, par le pere Coeffeteau, et par autres perſonnes ſages, que le dit* Ravilliac, *interrogē par eux ſur le parricide par lui commis, leur avoit repondu, conformēment aux maximes de* Mariana *de* Becanus, *et autres* [Jeſuits] *qui ont ecrit, qu'il etoit permis de tuer les Tyrans; la dite cour,* &c. Journal du Regne d'*Henry* IV, p. 212. See more proofs of *Ravilliac's* deriving his principles from the jeſuits, in *Hoſpinian's* Hiſt. Jeſuitica, p. 261. The weakeſt and one may juſtly call it the fatal, meaſure of Henry's government, was his reſtoration of the jeſuits, after a proſcription of ſome years, occaſioned by the atrocious attempt of John Chaſtel, one of their pupils, upon his life, in the year 1594. Whatever Henry's private reaſons might be for this indulgence, his compliance was certainly an inexcuſeable error, as not only the univerſity of Paris, but the Parliament would have ſupported him vigorouſly in the total excluſion of that pernicious ſect. This ſufficiently appears by what paſſed in the parliament about eighteen months after the King's tragical death. That court entered upon a reviſion of the letters patent the King had granted the jeſuits, permitting them to open their colleges, and refuſed to verify them but upon condition of their ſubſcribing the following propoſitions. "1. That a council is above the Pope. 2. That the Pope hath "no temporal power over Kings. 3. That clergymen having "heard of any attempt or conſpiracy againſt the King or his realm, "or any matter of treaſon, in confeſſion, they are bound to reveal "it. 4. That clergymen are ſubject to the ſecular prince or public "magiſtrate." I take theſe propoſitions, for brevity's ſake, from Heylin's Survey of the State of France, p. 224, 225. But they may be ſeen more at length in Hoſpinian's Hiſt. Jeſuit. p. 220. where there are likewiſe ſome conditions ſtill harder of digeſtion. *Heylin* ſays, they ſubmitted to them, and ſubſcribed; and it is probable enough they did, as the Parliament had peremptorily determined to prohibit their ſchools, if they refuſed. The famous *Fronto Ducæus* was their orator on this occaſion, who according to *Hoſpinian*, played the ſophiſter very dextrouſly. The Journal of the reign of *Henry* the Fourth gives us a curious inſtance of jeſuitical impudence and and fineſſe. It is in the laſt paragraph of the book, and is thus related. "On Monday the laſt day of May, and "very early in the morning, a number of jeſuits, accompanied by "ſome of their particular confidents, ſet out [from Paris] to carry "to their houſe of *La Fleſche* the heart of the king, which

During the reign of Lewis the thirteenth, the administration of the French government was wholly in the hands of an ambitious and tyrannical churchman, the Cardinal de Richelieu, which is sufficient to characterise it, without descending to particulars. Under a minister of that profession, it is not to be expected the state would attempt to profit at the expence of the church.*

The opposition of Lewis XIV, to the see of Rome, was on several occasions, more open and avowed; and in some of these he had the concurrence of the secular clergy, under the notion of his protecting the liberty of the Gallican church, against the claims of the Roman Pontiff; where indeed the interest of the crown

" had been granted to them on their repeated solicitations. But " they would not have carried it off without noise and disturbance, " if the affair had got wind among the people." The reason is plain, the people were persuaded that the man who had murdered the king on the 14th of the same month, was a pupil of the jesuits.

* The Cardinal indeed talked high to the Pope upon some occasions; that is to say, when his holiness was not so ready to gratify him or his creatures in their particular demands, as he expected. Vie de Richelieu. Vol. II. p. 386. But his inclination to maintain the church in its full power at the expence of the state, appears from his advising the king to abolish the appeals of the secular clergy from their bishops to the courts of parliament. Servien, the Advocate-general, was so sensible of the great advantage of keeping the clergy in a due dependance upon the state by the means of these appeals, that he used to say, " had he known the author of so wise and and salutary a regulation, he would have erected his statue." See *Testament Politique de Cardinal Duc de* Richelieu, sect. xi. It should seem, by what Mr. Duchat says, in a note upon Henry Stephens's apology for Herodotus, vol. I. p. 62. of the Hague edition, 1735, that those bishops whom he calls *Constitutionaires*, made no scruple, in order to accomplish this abolition, to attempt by their man-

was full as much concerned as that of the church.* This, however, was a strain of complaisance in the prelates, which Lewis was obliged to purchase with the sacrifice of the true interest of France to what they demanded in return, namely, the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and the persecution of his protestant subjects, by which multitudes of the most useful of them were driven into other countries; of which false policy France has severely felt the effects.

dates.the abolition of the prerogatives of the crown,and the liberties of the Gallican church. For the rest, the infamous use he made of the religious of both sexes at Loudun, in the prosecution of Urbian Grandier, shews that he well knew to what services of tyranny and despotic vengeance the enthusiastic bigotry of those fraternities might be turned. This consideration, it is probable enough, made him the more desirous to have the bulls for the confirmation of his dignity of Abbot-general of the *Cistercians* and *Premonstrants* expedited from Rome. It is certain nothing ever provoked his resentment against the Pope more than the delay of those bulls. But the Pope, no doubt, knew as well as the Cardinal, the probable consequences of putting those large and opulent communities under the government of so enterprizing a genius, with the whole civil power of France in his hands. *Vie de* Richelieu, u. s. After perusing a variety of memoirs of this Cardinal, wherein he is uniformly represented by all, but his fulsome panegyrists, as adapting his politics solely to the preservation of his power, and the purposes of his ambition and revenge, one cannot but wonder upon what facts a late biographer of Henry IV. should reckon *Richelieu* among those French ministers who pursued the salutary and spirited plans of government delineated by that monarch. See Appendix to the *Monthly Review*, vol. XXXIV. p. 562. It is for the honour of *Salmasius*, that he refused a large pension from *Richelieu*, because the condition was that he should write the Cardinal's history in latin. See *Guy Patin's* Letters, vol. I. Lett. ii. and the reason there given by *Salmasius* himself.

* This is to be understood of the affair of the *Regale*, which however was strenuously opposed by the bishops of *Alet* and *Pamiers*, who betook themselves to the protection of the Pope against the pretensions of the king; and here began the differences between Lewis

Such being the malignant effect which popish principles have upon civil government, even in the hands of arbitrary monarchs, who might be supposed to have the most immediate means of controuling their exorbitant claims and pretensions, it behoves us to consider what might be the consequence of its gaining an establishment in a state whose constitution is founded upon the most generous principles of public liberty, the very idea of which must be totally

XIV and Innocent XI.* Theſe two biſhops were Janſeniſts, that is to ſay, they were of that denomination of religioniſts, who had complained to the Pope of the ſcandal given, and the miſchief occaſioned, by the looſe morality of the jeſuits, and had obtained a formal cenſure of it from the congregation *de propaganda fide*. This provocation detached the jeſuits from the Holy See of courſe, at leaſt from the Pope then reigning, and engaged them to the court of France, and the biſhops who adhered to it, in oppoſition to the Pope; a ſtep which naturally expoſed the jeſuits to the reproach of having broken their fourth vow; viz. of abſolute obedience to the Pope. "But," ſays Biſhop Burnet, "that the zealous catholics of "France might not be ſcandalized with a method of proceeding, "that ſeemed contrary to the obedience uſually paid to the ſee of "Rome, the jeſuits, in concert with the Archbiſhop of Paris, re- "ſolved to carry on at the ſame time another deſign, that ſhould "both clear them of the imputations that might otherwiſe have been "caſt upon them, of deſigning to divide France from that ſee, and "likewiſe gratify their hatred of the proteſtants; and ſo they ſet on "the king to proſecute them with all the ways both of craft and ſe- "verity that could be invented; and, by this zeal againſt hereſy, "they ſuggeſted, that the king might well cover his conteſts for the "*Regale*, which he pretends is due by the right of the crown." *Preface to the Hiſtory of the Rights of Princes*, &c. p. 42. A Preface well worth reading by all proteſtants, even by thoſe to whom the hiſtory of the *Regale* is of no conſequence.

* "If I remember well, the protection that was granted by In- "nocent xi. to ſome biſhops of France, perſecuted for not conſent- "ing to the extenſion of the Regale, was the firſt ſtep that provoked "the court of France." Bayle. Innocent xi. [F.]

extinguished, before way can be made for the very lowest of its usurpations.*

Our reforming forefathers were perfectly sensible of this, and were proportionably thankful for their deliverance from so destructive a superstition. We of this generation, who contemplate popery only in historical narrative, or in the twilight of a partial practice, have but a

* As the civil government of this country hath no points to settle with the Pope, on the subject of distinct powers and privileges, like that of the *Regale* in France, the *active obedience* of British and Irish Roman Catholics, who pledge no faith or allegiance to a Protestant government, must be wholly engrossed by the *Head of the Church*. Hence it is obvious, that "the *passive submission* of Papists to Pro-"testant civil establishments under which they happen to live," which has been made an argument by their late apologists for tolerating Popery in Great Britain and Ireland, is not the effect of their religious principles but merely of the coercion of our laws. The Pope, as Head of the Church, is alone the Lord and master of every British and Irish Papist; and, by the fundamental principles on which his authority is erected, no such Papist must even be passively submissive to a prince or government declared by the said Pope to be heretical, without his special dispensation; and how such dispensation must be qualified and limited may be easily conceived. The free toleration of such persons in a Protestant state, can never be justified by any rules of sound policy. But, even granting that the passive submission of every Papist to every civil establishment is the doctrine of the church of Rome, how far ought this principle to recommend the Roman Catholics to their fellow-subjects of the British empire? Let this point be decided by one of the latest, but not the least valuable, of our Historians, the incomparable Mrs. Catharine Macaulay. "A people whose religious principles teach them active obedience "and passive submission to all civil establishments under which they "shall happen to live, whether those establishments are introduced "by fraud, violence, or common assent, whether calculated for ge-"neral or partial good, whether tyrannical or legal, may indeed, as "proper tools of iniquity, be looked on with an eye of favour by "ill-designing governors; but, on this account, must be regarded "with contempt, jealousy, and aversion, by a people who possess the "blessings of Liberty, who know its value, who are acquainted "with the equal rights of men, and understand the rational princi-"ples of government and subjection." Hist. Vol. III. p. 78.

faint and obscure notion of their joy and transport upon its expulsion from this land of liberty, when they found themselves set free from *the Tyranny of the Bishop of* Rome, *and all his detestable enormities*, as it is well expressed in the litany of King Edward VI.*

It appears, however, from some instances in our history, that the cultivation of this great blessing came to be neglected much sooner than they, who reflect upon the peace and freedom which a thorough reformation from popery should have brought along with it, may be apt to imagine. Some traces of a deviation from the spirit of our first reformers may be discovered in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and still more in the times of her immediate successors; and to this the mischievous fruits of the reli-

* "Some hard expreſſions," ſaith Dr. Heylin, "there are of "him [the Pope] in the Book of Homilies, but none more hard "than thoſe in the public Litany firſt publiſhed by King Henry "VIII, at his going to Boulogne; and afterwards retained in both "Liturgies of King Edward VI, in which the people were to pray "for their deliverance from *the tyranny of the Biſhop of* Rome, "*and his deteſtable enormities*, &c. This was conceived to be (as "indeed it was) a very great ſcandal and offence to all thoſe in the "realm of England who were well affected to the church of Rome, "and therefore in the Liturgy of Queen Elizabeth it was quite left "out, the better to allure them to the divine ſervice of the church, "as at firſt it did." Life of Archbiſhop Laud, Introd. p. 19. Dr. Nicholls likewiſe (the learned Commentator on our Liturgy) calls it a rough expreſſion. Pref. p. vi. It was however, I apprehend, the view of our firſt Reformers to cure all the ſubjects of the realm of England of their affection for the church of Rome, with whoſe enormities the ſaid reformers were well acquainted. And if, in the proſecution of this endeavour, they thought truth their proper object, rather than politeneſs, who can juſtly blame them? The event ſhewed that this expedient, and ſome others of the ſame ſort, had but little effect in reconciling thoſe who were well affected to the church of Rome to the ſervice of the Reformed church of England.

gious broils of those times may be very justly ascribed.*

* " The reformed in these times" (says Mr. Strype, under the year 1559) " generally went upon this ground, that, in order to " the complete freeing the church of Christ from the errors and cor- " ruptions of Rome, every usage and custom practised by that apos- " tate and idolatrous church should be abolished, and that all their " ceremonies and circumstances of religious worship should be clearly " abrogated ; and that the service of God should be most simple, " stript of all that shew, pomp, and appearance, that had been cus- " tomarily used before : esteeming all that to be no better than su- " perstitious and antichristian." Life of Archbishop Grindal, p. 28. Mr. Strype says this upon occasion of Grindal's scrupling the habits, and certain other ceremonies, upon his election to the see of London. The scruple arose in the days of K. Edward VI, and I cite Mr. Strype only as giving an account of the ground of it. The scrupulous in these matters not only found no precedents for things of this kind in the New Testament, but imagined at least that they there found something extremely unfavourable to any attempts to introduce them into christian worship. Hence they concluded that no human power had authority to injoin them. Grindal however submitted, probably on the considerations suggested to him by Peter Martyr. But, being a man of great moderation, and, allowing for the circumstances of the times, of liberal sentiments towards those who differed from him, it is not to be supposed that he would be very severe in urging conformity upon others in whom he found the same scruples that himself had once entertained ; and from some instances of his lenity towards dissenters in these matters arose, I conceive, the notion that *he held the reins too loose* in this respect. Strype, u. s. p. 301. Archbishop Whitgift, who succeeded Grindal in the see of Canterbury, was of a different turn. He had not the same idea with the reformed, mentioned by Strype, of the ceremonies established in the church of England. It is to be supposed he saw nothing unfavourable to them in the scriptures of the New Testament, and at the same time thought that the church had a scriptural authority for injoining them. And thus far, whatever inconvenient dissensions might arise from his strict adherence to these principles, he did not appear, so far as his own judgment was concerned, to desert the protestant principle of scripture authority, though he deviated from the sentiments of the first reformers on this head, and, is said to have given occasion to the papists to make a perverse use of his principles. See his Life by Strype, chap. xviii. p. 265. But in the next reign matters were carried to a still greater

The injudicious, and, in the end, unhappy princes of the house of Stuart, had all of them the same mistaken notions of uncontroulable kingly power, and all of them the same views of exalting it at the expence of the legal rights and privileges of their subjects. But the principles of civil and religious liberty collected from the scriptures, which the reformation had opened, and from the records of the English constitution, which began, about the accession of James I, to be more diligently examined, gave rise to a patriotic spirit of vigilance, which greatly indisposed the guardians of public liberty for submission to the illegal claims which were made upon them.* Some mistaken prin-

distance from the original protestant principle. In the correspondence between King James I. and Archbishop Abbot, concerning the divorce of the Earl of Essex, the Archbishop had laid it down as incontestable, that "the scripture directly, or by consequence, doth "contain in it sufficient matter to decide all controversies, espe-"cially in things appertaining to the church." Case of the Earl of Essex, and Lady Howard, p. 139. To which the King replied, "This, in my opinion, is *propositio erronea*, and one of the Puri-"tans grounds, without a better distinction or explanation. For "the orthodox proposition is, that the scripture doth directly or by "consequence contain in itself sufficient matter to decide all contro-"versies in points of faith and salvation." Ibid. p. 149. Now if ceremonies were not points of faith and salvation, as I think it was pretty generally allowed in those days, it followed from his Majesty's explanation, that the church had authority to decide controversies relating to those matters, exclusive of the scripture. And upon this question indeed turned those religious disputes which occasioned so much of the miserable confusion in succeeding times, and which ended so fatally in the next reign.

* Not that the constitution was not well understood in the foregoing reign; or that the patriots of those times were insensible to infringements upon it. The contrary appears by what passed in Queen Elizabeth's last parliament concerning monopolies. But this Queen knew how to speak to her parliaments on those occasions, and, as Rapin Thoyras observes, "had the good fortune to be believed,

ciples espoused by particular divines, and inculcated by them, as far as their influence would reach, persuaded these misguided monarchs, that the unlimited prerogative of sovereign princes was a doctrine founded upon the scriptures, and consequently must be the doctrine of all reformed churches. Hence it is that we find so many appeals to the sacred oracles in those things which were spoken and written in favour of arbitrary government on the part of kings, and of absolute submission to it by the people, during the reign of the Stuart family.*

" becauſe the Engliſh, in her reign, were in reality the happieſt " people under the ſun. They ſaw no deſigns upon their liberties, " nor any infringement of their privileges encouraged." Hiſtory of England, Tindal's tranſlation, 8vo, 1731, vol. IX. p. 215. King James's ſpeech to his firſt parliament gave a general diſguſt, and was an early preſage of what was to be expected from his notions of government. This, as the ſame hiſtorian obſerves, " put the " parliament upon their guard," and conſequently upon preparing themſelves, by ſtudying the principles of the Engliſh government with more accuracy, to obviate the claims that the new ſovereign might make upon them. A patriotic ſentiment is recorded in the *Journals of the Houſe of Commons*, vol. I. p. 156, to have been dropped in a conference with the Lords during this firſt parliament of King James, which Mrs. Macaulay (a very competent judge of the political learning of thoſe days) obſerves, was extraordinary for this time. Hiſt. Vol. I. p. 11, and ſhews that there was room for improvement in the general doctrines of civil government, as well as in thoſe which related more particularly to our conſtitution. King James IIſt's pretenſions and attempts promoted the cultivation of both, as appeared by the event.

* King James II amuſed himſelf with this conceit to the very laſt. In his memorial or proteſtation againſt what ſhould be done or omitted, in prejudice of his title at the peace of Ryſwick, addreſſed to the proteſtant princes of Europe, he ſays, " The princes of the " communion of Augſburgh are obliged to repair the injury done " to their religion, by an act which diſhonours it" [meaning his dethroniſation] ; " and that they could not better do this than by procur-

But when it was found, that protestants refused to abide by the false and fallacious interpretation of the scriptures, alledged for the support of arbitrary power, and that they appealed to the sacred writings in their turn in justification of their asserting their legal rights and privileges, it became necessary for the purposes then in view, to encourage other principles of religion and civil government, namely, such as might dispose the people to be more pliant to the yoke which the court-sycophants of those days were preparing for them.

For this purpose nothing could be better calculated than the religion of the church of Rome, which exacted a blind submission to all her dictates, and which had never refused to lend her aid to civil tyranny, upon condition of being supported, in her turn, by the authority and power of the secular arm. And hence

" ing the re-eſtabliſhment of a king dethroned contrary to the ſyſtem " of the proteſtant communion." *Hiſtoire de Camiſards*, vol. I. p. 18. Mr. Tindal, in his continuation of Rapin, vol. XVIII, p. 380, ſays, that " King William had advice from the Hague, " that King James's memorials were ſo little conſidered there, that " the offering an anſwer to them would give them ſome credit, and " that, without that, they had none at all." But the French author from whom I have cited a paſſage out of one of them, has likewiſe given us part of the anſwer which was returned by the princes to whom the appeal was made to the following purpoſe. " That his [King James's] degradation was founded upon his ſub- " verſion of the fundamental laws of the ſtate, the avenging of " which the Engliſh nation pretended belonged to herſelf; that " ſuch is the conſtitution of her monarchy; and that every ſtate has " its laws, for which it is not anſwerable to any other ſtate; that he " ought to impute the revolution in Great Britain to his own ill " conduct, or the neceſſity of the times, of which the other princes " of chriſtianity, of whatever religion they ſhould be, had no obli- " gation upon them to change the ſcene." *Hiſt. Camiſards*, p. 19. As both the catholic and proteſtant princes were, according

it was that popery found so much indulgence from King James I, and his successor, and that so many endeavours were used by some churchmen of those days, to incorporate the superstitious modes and usages of the church of Rome with the public service of the church of England, as it was left by the reformers under Queen Elizabeth. Happily the people were aware of the artifice. Their jealousies and apprehensions kept them out of the snare, gave a timely check to the progress popery was making, and in the end brought down the resentment of

to my author, unanimous in this anſwer, it is plain that neither of them thought religion had any thing to do in the buſineſs. Paſſive obedience and non-reſiſtance have been called doctrines of the church of England in particular, and ſuch of the members of that church as have oppoſed the oppreſſive and illegal meaſures of the Stuart family have been reproached as deſerting the principles of their religion: a reproach which, if it is juſt, muſt belong to every member of the church of England, who hath pledged his faith and allegiance to the preſent government. But they who will be at the pains to read Archbiſhop Abbot's wiſe and honeſt reaſons for not licenſing *Sibthorpe's Sermon*: Ruſhworth, vol. I. p. 434—444, will readily ſee that the church of England owned no ſuch doctrines, not even from the early days of James I, as appears by the cenſures paſſed upon Biſhop Harſenet's ſermon, ib. p. 442. Dr. Worral, chaplain to the Biſhop of London, was weak enough to licenſe Sibthorpe's ſermon, *hand over head*, as the Archbiſhop expreſſes it. But afterwards conſulting the great Selden upon it, he was told by that gentleman, "that if ever the tide turned, and matters ſhould "be called to a reckoning, he would be hanged for publiſhing ſuch "a book." Ruſhworth, ib. p. 444. A certain proof that the church of England would not patroniſe the doctrines of it. Some people have been willing to diſown the members of the parliament of 1641, who oppoſed the arbitrary meaſures of Charles I. for ſons of the church of England. But this is carrying party prejudice to an unreaſonable length. The maxims of civil liberty, on which they proceeded at the firſt, were neither more nor leſs than the principles of Archbiſhop Abbot above-mentioned, exemplified in practice,

an irritated nation upon the heads of those who were the most active in the contrivance.

These, however, were not the last efforts made by the men, who, under the name of protestants, entertained these principles. The doctrines of passive obedience to the state, and of submission to the authority of the church in its utmost latitude, were by the means abovementioned, deeply rooted in the minds of considerable numbers, and occasionally brought forth the pernicious fruits of civil oppression, and ecclesiastical persecution. At length, after many struggles and some disappointments, King James II found an opportunity of giving the last generation something more than a taste of what was to be expected, if ever popery should once more become the established religion of Britain. On that occasion the eyes of the nation were opened at once; a deliverance was earnestly sought, and, by the blessing of a kind Providence, happily found in the revolution under the conduct of King William, when the enjoyment and security of British Liberty were once more restored, and legal provision made, as much as possible, to prevent a return of those evils which popish principles, backed by temporal power have never failed to produce.

The penal laws enacted on that occasion against popery have been called severe, and unreasonable, and some writers, under a protestant mask at least, have seconded the papists in pleading for a repeal of them. But there are two things which are commonly overlooked by those who frame arguments for such repeal.

1. They who made these laws had an opportunity of contemplating the naked features of popery, stripped of all disguise. They saw the

bitter enmity it bore to the civil and religious rights of mankind, and were consequently better judges of what was necessary for the future security of the British constitution, than we of this generation, who, thanks to a kind providence, have had no such experience.

2. The papists who have demeaned themselves with any tolerable prudence, have had no more to complain of from the severity of these laws, than if they were not obnoxious to them; and even the indiscreet zeal of others of them has been overlooked and connived at, through the lenity of the government, in cases where they have laid themselves sufficently open, to justify the severest restraints prescribed by law for the safety of the public. Hence we may learn to what degree the pestilent influence of popish bigotry works upon the human spirit, when even they who are tinctured with it cannot forbear provoking the very government, which protects them, not only in the peaceable enjoyment of their temporal property, but even in their improvement of it in many cases, equally with those subjects who give the civil magistrate the utmost security for their allegiance.* Whatever may be thought of this

* The fortunes which many Roman Catholics have made, and are still making, in Trade, and in the professions of Physic and Law, are well known, as well as the equal justice they meet with, whenever their property comes under litigation in our courts of Law. and that in cases where more than the interest of a particular subject has been at issue. The statutes relating to the succession of the next Protestant heir to the estate of a Popish recusant, during the life of such recusant, are not often known to have any material operation. And with respect to the right of presentation to benefices in the patronage of Papists, vested, by several statutes, in the two universities of Cambridge and Oxford, it is not always where the title comes into litiga-

indulgence in a patriotic view, it is greatly for the honour of the protestant principle of toleration; at the same time that the returns the civil government meets with for it, afford the strongest reasons for not relaxing those necessary provisions which alone prevent the spirit of popery from proceeding farther than verbal insults upon our happy constitution.

To give a circumstantial detail of the disturbances this unquiet spirit of popery hath given to our civil government, from the revolution to the present times, would carry me to a tedious and needless prolixity. Large extracts in proof of this perpetual agitation in bigoted minds, that *are like the troubled sea which cannot rest*, might be given from our domestic histories, and to these I must refer such as desire to have a more particular account.

The last defeat of the more open efforts of popery to overturn our constitution, namely, the suppression of the rebellion in 1746, kept the Roman catholics for a while in a state of apparent acquiescence. It was necessary, upon such an event, to conceal their sense of that disappointment, that they might not too much exasperate their loyal fellow-subjects, as yet full of a generous resentment for this instance of popish ingratitude to one of the best of princes. Yet even during this seemingly pacific interval, instances of popish industry have by accident

tion, that the University's clerk is successful. Whence it appears, that the claimants under Popish Transfers have at least equal justice, as those laws are now modified. That the legislature, when these laws were enacted, thought the public highly interested in the objects of them, sufficiently appears from their several preambles; and reason, common sense, and undeniable facts, demonstrate, that they are equally interesting to the public, at this very moment.

come to light, secretly at work to prepare the mine, against the time when the forgetfulness of past mischiefs, and inattention to manifest tokens of more in hatching, together with a new succession of men; who, being, for want of experience, unapprised of the genius and spirit of popery, might be less vigilant over the precious deposit of civil and religious liberty; should give these dark working engineers an opportunity to spring it.*

* See the Appendix No. III, and a pamphlet intitled, Mr. A——d's *Motives for renouncing the Popish and re-embracing the Protestant Religion*, &c. published in 1758. This publication was incidentally occasioned by the controversy which arose between the late Mr. Bower, author of *The History of the Popes*, and some persons who questioned the sincerity of his conversion from popery. The controversy is before the public, and it is not to my purpose to meddle with the merits of it, so far as Mr. Bower's integrity was concerned. I beg leave only to make a few observations on some matters of fact, brought to light on the one side and the other, in the course of the debate. Mr. Bower's personal character with respect to the two articles of religion and morals, was, without doubt, of great consequence to himself, and to such of his Protestant friends as had afforded him their countenance and patronage; and of some consequence too to the public, considering him as a writer in defence of the Protestant Reformation; the less so indeed, as the press was left open to him to make his own particular defence. But this was not of any material importance to the public, in comparison with the nature and extent of the influence the Jesuits appeared to have obtained in this country, and the use and application of those funds of money, of which, by the accounts of both parties, they were then possessed. In Mr. A——d's pamphlet, facts are related, still more alarming to the friends of our Protestant establishment, and these Mr. A—— offered to confirm upon oath. Many persons, about that time, wished that some legal cognisance might be taken of the discoveries made by this gentleman, and that the whole scene of jesuitical traffic, of which so many interesting particulars had transpired upon occasion of this controversy, might be laid open and verified by public authority. It seemed to be a matter of general concern, that a set of men residing in this kingdom, belonging to a religious society, made up of immediate liegemen of the Pope, and sworn

Such, it is probable, the Roman catholics and their abettors may esteem the present times to be, if we may judge of their sentiments by their late increasing activity and assurance in attempting to make proselytes, and in the apologies that have been made for them in a va-

enemies to the protestant religion, and to all the patrons and protectors of it, should have a considerable sum of money appropriated to the peculiar uses of their order and mission, and consequently so likely to be employed in such mischievous designs, as this protestant state has always had reason to apprehend from men of their principles and dispositions. It could not be nothing to the public that these men "should have their solemn annual assemblies, boast of their "numbers, and the fine appearance they made on those occasions, "of the great good that they and their coadjutors of other orders did "in the large and populous city of London;—that they should tri-"umph and exult upon any political events, that seemed to them un-"favourable to the interests of Great Britain, and even appear in a "military uniform to testify their readiness to enlist with her ene-"mies;—that they should make it their common practice to drink "treasonable healths, with menaces of revenge to the protestant "clergy, and others who opposed the views of a popish Pretender "and his adherents; and that they should even traduce the ministers "of state, and many great men of the kingdom, in those times, as "being of their religion." Motives, p. 58, 59, 60. I say nothing of the crimes imputed to them by M. A——d, on account of which, men of all religions are equally amenable to public justice, farther than just to observe that they who palliate such crimes, and screen the criminals upon pretended principles of religion, instead of being tolerated in the open profession of such religion, should be expelled from every civil society without the least hesitation. Had these matters of fact been properly traced by authority, immediately upon Mr. A——d's information thus given to the public, some at least of the offenders might probably have been discovered, and dealt with as they deserved; or else (what would have given satisfaction another way) Mr. A——d might have been convicted as an impostor, who, for some particular interest of his own, thought proper to amuse and alarm the public with mere chimæras and inventions of his own brain.—May I here venture to touch upon another point suggested by this controversy of Mr. Bower? It is indeed a tender one, but worthy, in my humble opinion, of a little consideration from the public, in what way, I pretend not to judge. I have been

riety of publications, particularly in newspapers; in which undoubtedly their policy, as children of this generation, is to be commended. The short rescripts conveyed to the public through these channels, in the form of letters, seem to be calculated to make impressions

informed, upon the authority of ſome gentlemen of good ſenſe, and unqueſtionable honour, that they have, on their travels abroad, found, among the roman catholic clergy, men of learning and ingenuous minds, who have freely acknowledged a diſſatisfaction with their own ſyſtem, and at the ſame time an inclination to take refuge in ſome proteſtant country, where they might freely profeſs their religious ſentiments, provided they could be ſure of a ſubſiſtence. Might not ſome public proviſion for the maintenance of ſuch converts be made without any impropriety, at leaſt till, by ſome particular application of their reſpective talents, they might be made uſeful to themſelves and the community, without ſuch expence to the public? Some eſtabliſhment of this kind, wiſely and cautiouſly conditioned, ſeems to me to bid the faireſt for obviating, on the one hand, the complaints that have been made, that ſuch converſions have not been ſufficiently encouraged in this country, and, on the other, the reaſonable jealouſy that particular perſons, eſpecially in high ſtations, may entertain that their benevolence would be diſappointed, and their patronage diſgraced by the tergiverſation of an hypocrite, or a renegado. I find in a pamphlet, publiſhed in the year 1748, intituled, *An enquiry into the behaviour of our great churchmen ſince the reformation, &c.* the following paſſage. "When there are any of "their miſſionaries" [meaning roman catholics] "who, by reading, converſation, and probity of mind, are diſpoſed to become "converts to our church, how unhappy and diſmal are their circumſtances? They are ſure of feeling all poſſible effects of the "malice and revenge of the party they deſert, and have the diſcouraging proſpect of neglect, coldneſs, and ſuſpicion, with which "we have thought fit to treat ſuch converts. With a very few exceptions, this hath generally been the caſe ever ſince the revolution:" p. 21. Surely this writer, whoever he was, ſhould have ſupported this preremptory reflection by a competent number of inſtances, on the peril of being held injurious to his countrymen. That the party deſerted by ſuch converts hath moleſted them more or leſs by attempts either to bring them back, or to expoſe them to ſome hardſhip or ſcandal, is perhaps true in the caſe of every churchman who hath been converted from the popiſh to the proteſtant religion. But, ſo far as I have been able to obſerve, or to learn from enquiry,

upon a greater variety of readers, than arguments deduced in long and formal treatises, which are neither to be had at so easy an expence, nor so readily and generally dispersed

coldneſs, *neglect*, or *unreaſonable ſuſpicion*, towards ſuch converts, has not been juſtly or generally chargeable upon the preſent generation of britiſh proteſtants. There are and have been many remarkable examples to the contrary, among which the learned and reſpectable Dr. Courayer has a right to be firſt named. Father *Piazza* I perſonally knew at Cambridge. I have heard him acknowledge his obligations to particular patrons, and was an eye-witneſs of the regard paid him in the univerſity, where, while I knew him, he procured himſelf a comfortable ſubſiſtence by teaching the Italian language. Dr. Aſpinwall had nothing to complain of, unleſs ſome groundleſs ſuſpicions, which however did not prevent his enjoying a good preferment to the day of his death. I remember a venerable old clergyman of the name of Aylmer, beneficed in Lancaſhire, who was a convert from popery, and much reſpected and eſteemed in that country, as long as he lived. There are others, no doubt, in the ſame circumſtances, ſtill living, who have no reaſon to complain either of the coldneſs or neglect they meet with in this country. But the moſt ſingular inſtance of favour to converts from popery, to our purpoſe, is that of the late biſhop Hoadly, who being himſelf convinced of the ſincerity of *Pillioniere's* converſion, would not withdraw his patronage from him, notwithſtanding the ſuſpicions expreſſed of the ſaid *Pillioniere*, and the reflections caſt upon the biſhop for entertaining him, by thoſe who ſo warmly oppoſed his lordſhip's principles. That proper caution ſhould be uſed in giving credit or encouragement to converts from popery, particularly eccleſiaſtics, no one can deny, who recollects the inſtances of *Anthony de Dominis*, *Jarrige*, and others both at home and abroad. Stronger or more convincing marks of real converſion could hardly be given by men, than were exhibited in the writings of theſe two revolters: and whoever after theſe proofs of their converſion to the proteſtant religion ſhould have queſtioned their ſincerity, muſt have been thought, by every equitable mind, utterly void of all chriſtian charity. That ſome of the pretended converts from popery in theſe latter times have not been at all fitter to be truſted than theſe two, may be conjectured from ſome particulars in the late lord biſhop of *Winchester's* letter, concerning his lordſhip's affair with *Bernard Fournier*. I do not mention Mr. Bower's caſe as an authority one way or other. Great undoubtedly was his indiſcretion in what is called his money-tranſac-

among those who are most likely to be influenced by them.

I do not mention it as a circumstance to be regretted, that popish writers have had this free access to our public prints. Such liberty can never turn out to the disadvantage of the protestant cause, provided its advocates may be fairly heard in their turn, and have liberty to answer in the same way.*

tion with the Jesuits, which however, as the Jesuits are now so well known to have been traders in all kinds of merchandise, ought not to pass for more than it will fairly prove. But, however the matter might be taken by different parties while the litigation was on foot, every suspicion of Mr. Bower's halting between the two religions ought now to subside. Mr. Bower died a sincere and pious protestant, of which a complete and satisfactory attestation was given to the public by his respectable relict, in the *London Chronicle* of *October* 11, 1766.—Upon the whole, might not some asylum be provided, at the expence of the public, for such romish ecclesiastics as are disposed to come over to us, with a temporary subsistence, till they could be properly employed in particular stations? Might not this asylum be considered as a place of probation, till these refugees could procure proper and satisfactory credentials of their former behaviour, and give sufficient proof of their sincerity in embracing the protestant religion? I ask these questions with absolute deference to better judgments, and only by way of suggesting something of an expedient to take away all occasion for any complaints of neglect on the one hand, and for any jealousies on the other, with respect to such refugees. The roman catholics leave nothing short which may either distress or calumniate those who forsake their superstition. One curious method the papists in Ireland take for this purpose hath been signified in a late ingenious publication. It seems, they call renouncing the romish, and embracing the protestant faith, swallowing the scorpion. An expression well enough calculated to intimidate tender and superstitious minds. See Thoughts, Essays, &c. by C. Howard, Esq. p. 11. Let us take the hint to counteract this policy, by giving all possible encouragement to serious and sincere converts from the church of Rome.

* "What! (will the reader say) can it be made a question, "whether protestant writers may have free access to English news-"papers, in defence of the established religion?" Let him judge for himself, after perusing the following particulars. In the *Ga-*

Nor indeed have the Roman catholics been negligent in improving this liberty to their own advantage, by such kind of art and management as the feebleness of their cause required. They have accordingly brought to these conflicts a double portion of assurance to bear them out in contradicting the most authentic historical facts, as well as of jesuitical chicane whereby to evade the scandal of their detestable principles.

The champion who hath figured in this periodical warfare with the greatest parade, is one

zetteer of *February* 13, 1767, was a notification from the publishers of that paper in these words: "*The two letters concerning the* PAPISTS, *signed* IMPARTIAL, *we beg to be excused inserting: as we have very* PARTICULAR REASONS *for rejecting (for the future) every thing relative to* POPERY." What might be the particular subject of the letters signed IMPARTIAL does not appear; they might be for, or they might be against popery. But the determination, to reject every thing relative to popery, extended the proscription to protestant as well as popish advocates for their respective systems. As this must have been matter of some surprise to the public, somebody, it seems, thought proper to call upon the publishers of the newspapers for those particular reasons, mentioned in the notice above-cited. To which, in the *Gazetteer of Saturday, February* 21, 1767, the following answer was returned:—"*After mature deliberation, we must beg to be excused inserting the letter signed* A PROTESTANT *(occasioned by our notice of* "*declining,* "*for* particular reasons, *any more letters about popery*") *for fear of giving offence.*"—Here we have a glimpse of the *particular reasons*, &c. namely, *the fear of giving offence.* But to whom could the letter of a PROTESTANT *give offence*, on the subject of popery? To none but papists or their favourers. To what a pass must we be come, while the papists have sufficient interest to controul the British press, when writings in opposition to their principles and superstition are offered for publication, and to intimidate our printers with the consequences of giving them offence! It ought however to be mentioned, in justice to the publishers of the Gazetteer, that they have since got over their scruples, and exhibited several interesting letters on the protestant, as well as the popish side of the question.

who under the signature of *A Real Freethinker*, and with some equivocal efforts to pass himself upon the world for *a Protestant*, or at least for *no Papist*, published a series of letters in one of the daily news-papers, wherein the cause of popery was glossed over with as plausible a varnish, as a little acquaintance with such writers as Cardinal *Perron* and the Bishop of *Meaux* could furnish; and that too, oftentimes, weakened by the *Freethinker's* own *modifications*, the compounded produce of a confused head, and a conscious heart.*

* The daily paper in which the *Real Freethinker's* essays were retailed, was the Public Ledger; the publishers of which, to their honour, admitted several answers, which exposed, with great spirit and solidity, the dull malignant sophistry of the essayist; and at length drove him to the necessity of taking up the cause under a different signature. which gave him an opportunity of contradicting himself without the reproach of inconsistency: and when that would not screen him from his pursuers, ho thought fit to drop the newspaper contest, and to collect his *real freethinking* letters into a pamphlet, under the title of *A Free Examination of the common methods employed to prevent the growth of Popery*, where, by way of an *Introduction* and *Notes*, he had an opportunity of mangling, garbling, and variously falsifying and misrepresenting those who had written against him, at his leisure; in which he hath been detected, and very properly challised by an excellent hand in the *London Chronicle*, under the name of *Old Milton;* as likewise by some others. "We must however" (to borrow the language of Dr. Middleton) "allow these men to act like generous adversaries, in referring the merit of their arguments to the trial of the press; which, "in all countries where it can have its free course, will ever be "found the surest guardian of right and truth, and to which this par- "ticular country, among the many great blessings which it enjoys, "is manifestly indebted for one of the greatest, its deliverance from "a popish slavery; as all our histories testify, from the reformation "down to this day."—And for this very reason, when these men or their abettors pretend to controul the press, as in the circumstance, (note page 36, 37,) it is high time to check their insolence.

But I must here observe that our present controversy with the papists does not turn, as heretofore, so much upon those theological points which distinguish the protestant from the popish religion, as upon the merits of a particular question, namely, whether, *upon protestant principles*, the Roman catholics, as they affect to stile themselves, are not intitled to as full and free a toleration in Great Britain, as other sects or churches, who dissent from the ecclesiastical establishment.

This debate has been very artfully brought on. The grand objection to the toleration of popery is merely of the civil kind; that is to say the tendency of their tenets to subvert the civil as well as the religious rights of mankind in general, and in particular the security we, of this country, have for our civil and religious liberties, under those laws upon which the protestant settlement of our present government depends.

If this could be proved to be a mere prejudice, and if it could be shewn that the doctrine and discipline of the church of Rome had no such tendency; but that, on the contrary, a good papist was bound by his religion to be as obedient and peaceable a subject to a protestant as to a popish government, the great protestant principle of *tolerating all sects, whose doctrines do not interfere with the peace and order of the civil government*, must take place with respect to popery, equally as with respect to any other sect. And accordingly the matter of fact being presupposed, these popish writers have, with all freedom, urged the protestants with the consequences of their own principles, and, as

they have occasionally expressed themselves, *turned the tables upon them.**

The author who made the most of this kind of argument, was one who called himself a protestant, and under that candid appearance published a book, intitled, *The Trial of the Roman*

* But as there is nothing more difficult than for popery to wear the mask of moderation for any long time, it appeared by an incidental discovery, that they wanted to *turn the tables* upon us with a witness. The case was this: The great popular reproach which the papists and jacobites cast upon King William, and which they found made the strongest impression upon the common people, was, that he was A FOREIGNER; an objection to which the supposed son of James II. was not liable. To ridicule this idle and mischievous distinction, *Daniel de Foe* published his famous satire called *The True-born Englishman*. What reception this poem and its author met with in their day need not be mentioned. This prejudice of the people, however, continued to be managed and fomented occasionally by the disaffected, against the two first princes of the house of Brunswick during the time they filled the throne of Great Britain. All this while the *True-born Englishman* was alive and merry with his holiness at Rome. Upon the demise of his late majesty, our present most gracious sovereign George III. succeeded to the imperial crown of these realms, who, being born among us, silenced, to the great mortification of the papists and jacobites, the malevolent objection which had been made to his illustrious ancestors on account of their foreign birth. On January 1, 1766, died the old Chevalier, leaving his pretensions, (not alas! to a *True-born Englishman*, but) to a native of Italy. The *True-born Englishman* was now happily in possession, and the popish *Aspirant* a foreigner, and liable to all the objections which the party had thrown upon our glorious deliverer on that account. Now therefore was the time for them to turn the tables, and the opportunity was not to be lost. Immediately they republished *De Foe's* satire on the *True-born Englishman*, printed, as is said in the title-page, for *R. Richards*, next the *Cross-Keys Tavern, Holbourn*, 1765; which however did not make its appearance publicly till after the demise of the old Chevalier. But least the design of this publication should be mistaken, they took care to prefix to the poem a print of a young personage, who, though without a name, was sufficiently described by the adjoining *insignia*, namely, a shield, charged with the arms of the Sobieski family, with this motto, *sequi finemque tueri*. Underneath

Catholics of IRELAND; wherein the writers point was, to exculpate the Irish papists from the guilt of the horrid massacre of protestants in 1641. And the conclusion in view was, that the Irish papists, standing acquitted as to the fact, the motives upon which those inhuman butcheries were committed, and the principles upon which they have been supposed to be vindicated, were wrongfully ascribed to the doctrines of popery; which, according to this writer, are perfectly consistent with the profoundest submission to civil government, even when administered by those whom the church of Rome esteems to be heretics.*

About the same time (that the papists of England might not lose the benefit of the pleadings in the trial) appeared a pamphlet, intituled, *Considerations on the Penal Laws against Ro-*

the ſhield is the buſt of Charles I, and at the bottom the following verſes:

" Few know my face, tho' all men do my fame;
" Look ſtrictly, and you'll quickly gueſs my name.
" Thro' deſarts, ſnows, and rain, I made my way;
" My life was daily riſqu'd to gain the day.

" *I make no promiſes to thoſe that keep none,*"

The copy from which theſe particulars are taken, and which is now before me, was bought at a popiſh bookſeller's in January, 1766, as ſoon, it is believed, as any of them were expoſed to ſale. Be this as it may, we have here pretty ſtrong evidence what the papiſts mean by *turning the tables* upon us.

* The juſt and acute ſtrictures of Mrs. Macaulay upon this artful performance, Vol. III. of her excellent hiſtory, are ſufficient to expoſe it to the contempt of the public, without any farther remarks. The ſame topic has been taken up by the author of the *Free Examination* above mentioned, with a particular virulence againſt a

man Catholics in England, *and the new-acquired Colonies in* America; *in a Letter to a noble*

writer in the *Public Ledger*, who ſigned himſelf F. W. and who, by that, and ſome other circumſtances, ſeems to be the learned Dr. *Ferdinando Warner*, whoſe *hiſtory of the rebellion and civil war in Ireland* hath indeed, in ſome inſtances, ſeaſonably confronted the *Real Freethinker*, (metamorphoſed into a *citizen of the world*), on the ſubject of the Iriſh maſſacre. But if the ſaid *citizen* is not ſatisfied with the gentle manner in which the doctor hath repreſented theſe matters, he muſt be hard to pleaſe. For though the learned hiſtorian hath obſerved, that, before the rebellion broke out, the papiſts had "nothing to fear from the adminiſtration, and no animo-"ſities as to intereſt, or religion, appeared to ſubſiſt among them; "without the leaſt pretence of a quarrel, or the apprehenſion of any "hoſtility by the proteſtants," (which ſeems to be cauſe of the citizen's intemperate wrath againſt F. W.) yet the citizen muſt be very unreaſonable if he is not appeaſed by Dr. Warner's moderation, who permits himſelf to doubt whether Sir Phelim O'Neil's cruelties, committed in the progreſs of the rebellion, "ſhould leave any ſtain upon his religion." Hiſt. p. 106. This, ſurely, leaves the field open to this *Real Freethinking Citizen*, to prove, at his leiſure, and *after his own manner*, that neither the intereſts nor the principles of popery had any concern in the Iriſh rebellion from the beginning to the end of it. The papiſts, who are more than commonly zealous at this period to waſh the bloody ſtains from their predeceſſors of 1641, know very well what they mean by it, and others are no ſtrangers to the end they aim at. But it had much better become their preſent pretenſions, to have generouſly condemned the cruelty of their forefathers, and, by declaring their abhorrence of ſuch practices, to have convinced thoſe into whom they deſire to inſtill a better opinion of their religious and political principles, that thoſe principles are now very different from what they were in the days of Charles I. By taking the contrary courſe, and attempting to diſcredit the plaineſt and moſt authentic facts by incompetent evidence, they have gained nothing but the reproach of a ſhameful inconſiſtency, while apologizing for the outrages of the Iriſh papiſts in forty-one, by the provocations they received from the government, they deſtroy that argument for their farther toleration, which reſts upon the ſuppoſition, that their religion is calculated to promote abſolute paſſive ſubmiſſion under every ſort of government; and ſhew us in the moſt glaring light, that *popery is ſtill the ſame*, wearing the maſk of peace and gentleneſs no longer than an opportunity offers to uſe the inſtruments of zeal and vengeance againſt thoſe heretics

Lord, by a Country Gentleman. It must be acknowledged that there is, in this pamphlet,

who for the preſent may have them in ſubjection, by the force of laws, and the advantage of numbers; which accordingly we find it is their aim and their policy to leſſon as faſt as they can, by numerous converſions to their ſuperſtition. But even this vizzard of decency and prudence will only fit the countenances of the better-bred roman catholics. The popiſh vulgar are leſs ſcrupulous in avowing their ſpleen and enmity againſt both the government and religion of proteſtants; and are, generally ſpeaking, open enough to acknowledge that they owe their ſentiments on theſe ſubjects to the pious inſtructions of the very ſame prieſts whoſe miniſtrations are attended indifferently by the rich as well as the poor. The indiſcretion, indeed, of the ruder and leſs refined herd, the better ſort of roman catholics are obliged to diſown on critical occaſions. A notable inſtance of which we have in a pamphlet aſcribed (againſt a hundred probabilities to the contrary) to the Lord Viſcount *Taafe*, entitled, *Obſervations on affaires in Ireland, from the ſettlement in* 1691, *to the preſent time.* The queſtion was, whether the Iriſh Catholics were under any engagements to join Mr. Conflans, in caſe his projected deſcent upon Ireland in 1759 had taken place. To prove that they were not, their addreſſes to the Lord Lieutenant are referred to; but as it had appeared that the Iriſh catholics had early intelligence, of the deſign of the French Admiral (a ſort of intelligence, by the way, which is not uſually firſt ſent to people of the loweſt claſs), and were thereupon diſpoſed to triumph and inſult, this affair of addreſſing became but a kind of equivocal proof of loyalty, when ſet againſt facts, of which there had been ſo many witneſſes. Something therefore muſt be ſaid to theſe facts, or all was over with this argument; and that is thus ordered in the pamphlet, p. 18. "What "*a few deſperate men* might hope from ſuch an event, and what "they would have done in conſequence of its taking place, is *here* "*out of the queſtion.*" By no means, till it is ſhewn that theſe *deſperate* men were not roman catholics, and that they had not both their intelligence and their hope from roman catholics leſs deſperate than themſelves. Till that is cleared up, theſe circumſtances are not laid out of the queſtion, but begged, as a main part of it, which however we cannot agree to grant. Under this reprobation of *deſperate men*, are the attempts and intentions of the gentry called *white-boys*, endeavoured to be ſhifted from the more reſpectable Iriſh roman catholics, p. 20, 21, of this ſame pamphlet; probably enough with ſome ſucceſs among the credulous Engliſh. But what the well affected Iriſh proteſtants thought of it, the reader may judge

much more temper and civility than in any others that have appeared on that side the ques-

by an authentic paper in the Appendix, No. IV. The pamphlet before me informs us in a note, p. 20, that " A Candid inquiry " on this ſubject was then in the preſs, and would ſpeedily be pub- " liſhed, and to that the noble author [or his Amanuenſis] re- " fers." This pamphlet hath ſince appeared under the title of *a candid Enquiry into the Cauſes and Motives of the late Riots in the province of Munſter in Ireland, by the people called white-boys or levellers; with an Appendix containing other papers on the ſame ſubject, in a letter to a noble Lord in England.* This pamphlet I have read, and muſt think, either that his Lordſhip had never peruſed it, or that he was very ill adviſed, when he referred to it. To paſs by this enquirer's aſſurance in repreſenting the circumſtances in the caſe of *Nicholas Sheehy* the prieſt and his accomplices, as more favourable towards proving their innocence, than thoſe in the caſe of the French proteſtant *Calas*, [Pref.] and thereby preferring the *equity* of that execrable proſecution to the juſtice of Ireland in the condemnation of Bridge's murderers.——To paſs by his modeſt requeſt to his correſpondent, to believe nobody but the Enquirer himſelf,—he hath totally deprived Sheehy the prieſt of the benefit of Lord Taafe's apology, of being one of a few deſperate men, &c. by an Extract from *Exſhaw's Magazine* for April 1766, at page 58 of his pamphlet; where we are informed that Sheehy " en- " joyed an income of two hundred pounds a year." In the ſame page we we are told that Sheehy the prieſt " appeared in the charac- " ter of a plain man, free from deſign." But this the pamphleteer himſelf forbids us to believe, and characteriſes him as " a giddy, of- " ficious, but not ill-meaning man, with ſomething of a Quixotiſh " caſt of mind, towards the relieving of all thoſe, whom he fancied " to be injured or diſtreſſed." p. 7. Circumſtances tending to induce the ſtrongeſt probability of his being capable of undertaking every thing laid to his charge. And as to his meaning, it could not be ill, where it was directed by a zeal for his religion. Page 19. this conſiſtent enquirer pretends to be a proteſtant: " *Our* religion, my Lord," ſays he, " derives no benefit from the impoſing on pa- " piſts opinions which are manifeſtly inconſiſtent with their avowed " and moſt eſſential tenets." But a proteſtant of common reading would have known, that the avowed and the eſſential tenets of popery are two very different things, as hath appeared to the whole world in the caſe of Boſſuet Biſhop of Meaux, and from the moral tenets of the jeſuits; a matter of fact which invalidates the whole force of his inferring the innocence of the ſufferers, either from their princi-

tion. No art or address is wanting to conciliate the minds of English protestants either to

ples or their dying protestations. In short the very abstract of their trials, exhibited in the Appendix of this curious performance, exculpates the judge and jury who tried them from every the least suspicion of partiality or undue prejudice; as might be shewn by going into particulars. The repeated and consistent evidence of *John Londergan* or *Lonergan*, the boy of 19, is remarkable. For this boy's evidence *no stews were raked, no goals rummaged*, nor was he found to be a stranger to the persons of the accused, when confronted at their trial, p. 23. For "the court indulged "the prisoners to change their dress before Lonergan swore "to the identity of their persons; who, notwithstanding their "disguise, and their being mixed with a number of people, pointed "them out with the cryer's staff." p. 57. Pendergrast's evidence, in favour of the prisoners, is totally overthrown by Tennison, p. 55. "The evidence of James Herbert for the crown, was "very circumstantial, and was not attempted to be invalidated, ei-"ther in regard to his testimony or his character," p. 56. But Edmond Sheehy declares, "he never saw Herbert till the day of his trial," p. 63. Perhaps not *in a pair of leathern breeches*, or *a blue coat*, or not *in a court of justice*. But *Edmond Sheehy* could hardly be a stranger to Herbert's errand to the assizes, namely, to give evidence on the behalf of his accomplice *Nicholas*. At least our *Candid Enquirer* was no stranger to it, when he attempted to vilify this man, p. 13. of his pamphlet. But does he consider that the more black he makes Herbert, the more suspicions he creates of the sort of witnesses picked up in behalf of his favourite Sheehy the priest? This was probably the prudential consideration, which restrained Edmond Sheehy's council from any attempt to invalidate Herbert's testimony on Edmond's trial, and Edmond himself from making use of that circumstance, of never seeing Herbert before, till he was just going to execution. And yet, possibly, that very supposition would have overthrown every thing Herbert had to say in favour of Father Sheehy, had his evidence been received on the behalf of that priest. One might bring many more instances of this *Candid Enquirer's* self confutation, which, for the avoiding of prolixity, must be omitted. One remark, however, I cannot pass by, upon the sub-enquiry of the public spirited and protestant hearted M. S. Esq. exhibited in the Appendix, p. 25. "The persons [mean-"ing the rioters of 1762] were papists, and the violence broke out "in the time of war. As papists, we know them hurried on by a "blind religious zeal, and believe them in general, as different from "protestants in political as religious sentiments. We are not quite

the spirit or the principles of popery; but the protestants of the church of England more particularly, by shewing that the whole form and fashion of that church is borrowed from the

" mistaken in this judgment of them; but we are often widely so in " the consequence we attempt to draw from it; that they are ever " ripe for rebellion, and if any opportunity offered, would massa- " cre us in our beds," p. 27. But surely there could be no wide mistake in attempting to draw the consequences mentioned in the present case. " The Irish papists, in general, are hurried on by " a blind religious zeal, and are as different in politics from pro- " testants as in religion." That is to say, they are equally hur- ried by a blind zeal in politics as religion. These Irish papists turn riotous at a time when the protestant government is at war with a popish enemy, and when the said papists (p. 29) might have expected a foreign aid. What hinders us then from concluding, that these rioters of 1762 (and the present question concerns these only) were ripe for rebellion, or who can pretend to say, what they would not have done, urged on by these principles and dispositions, if a farther opportunity had offered? Upon the whole nothing could have been more unfortunate for the observations ascribed to Lord Taaffe, than the publication of this pamphlet, upon which so much of the credit of the observations is made to depend. That the better sort of roman catholics kept fair with government both in England and Ireland, during all the various disturbances given by the white boys, is neither to be doubted nor wondered at: nor was it advisable for the government to discover what sentiments they entertained of all those professions of roman catholic loyalty, on all occasions. But what those sentiments were, appeared sufficiently at a proper time; namely, in the Lord Lieutenant's admirable speech to the Irish parliament, October 1763. part of which I shall here transcribe, as a full answer to so much of the pamphlets above noted as relates to the case of the rioters in 1759, 1762. and 1763. " No means can serve more effectually to prevent these " disorders for the future, than the encouragement of such institutions " as tend to impress on the minds of the lower order of people, " early habits of industry, and TRUE PRINCIPLES OF RELI- " GION. For this purpose your PROTESTANT CHARTER " SCHOOLS were established; to which I THEREFORE recom- " mend the continuance of your care, encouragement, and support." This, I suppose, is decisive, and sufficient to shew in what degree *false principles of religion* (which, by the way, are not peculiar to the lower order of people) were understood by the government to contribute to those disorders.

Roman, to which, as this writer will have it, the church of England is indebted even for the scriptures of the Old and New Testament; besides other articles of consequence to our present ecclesiastical constitution, which are there particularly enumerated.*

* " This enumeration is as follows: "The clergy of the eſtabliſhed " church, received the ſacred depoſit of the old and new teſtaments " from their Roman catholic predeceſſors. It is from them alſo they " are ambitious of deriving their miſſion and ordination; and the " labours of father Courayer for that purpoſe, have been received " with applauſe. Every poſitive article of belief is, in a manner, " taken from the Roman catholic faith; and beſides the holy bible, " the rule of that faith remains in part the ſame, as the Apoſtles " creed, the Athanaſian creed, the four firſt general councils, and a " regard for the authority of the antient fathers of the church. There " is alſo nearly the ſame hierarchy, the orders of biſhops, prieſts, and " deacons, and the like canons for fixing the ſubordination and ec- " cleſiaſtical diſcipline; the ſame books are put into the hands of the " laity; *The Whole Duty of Man*, *Thomas a Kempis*, *The Intro-* " *duction to a devout Life*, and many books of that ſort, tranſlated " by Dr. Stanhope, and other eminent divines. Likewiſe, the " having a ſet form of public prayer, and *very little variation of the* " *prayers themſelves*, except the difference of language, and what " regards the interceſſion of ſaints. The more minute or ceremo- " nial part of the former worſhip has alſo been preſerved; the par- " ticular and decent garb of eccleſiaſtics, the uſe of the ſurplice, of " the ſign of the croſs in baptiſm, bowing at the name of Jeſus. The " ſame days are allotted for commemorating the myſteries of the " chriſtian religion, organs, bells, and even placing the communion- " table, the ſituation of which was regulated ſeveral different ways " in Edward VI. reign; but when the church of England was eſta- " bliſhed, it was fixed in the old place, and reſtored *by ſome* to its " more ſolemn name of altar. This ſimilitude, I ſuppoſe, gave oc- " caſion to the church of England's being ſtyled *Calvino-papiſta*, by " the German Lutherans. The calviniſtical part is very much for- " ſaken, and the gloomy predeſtinarian ſyſtem is exchanged for a " more chearful and reaſonable doctrine." *Conſiderations*, p. 63, 64, 65. Thus we ſee even this artful writer, while he is ſoliciting a favour from our rulers, cannot reſiſt the temptation of ſneering the church of England, for her conformity to popery in ſo many material articles. It is indeed a clumſy banter enough, and ſo expreſſed, as

But, whatever artifice this dextrous advocate may have thrown into this insidious composition, he labours in common with the rest of his fellow-drudges in the same cause, under the incurable infirmity of inconsistency and misrepresentation in matters of fact.* It could

to place bells and organs among the myſteries of the chriſtian religion. But it is a repreſentation well adapted to the capacity of the vulgar, and is of no ſmall uſe to the papiſts (to my certain knowledge) in their work of converſion. A circumſtance which requires our moſt ſerious attention; and more eſpecially as the want of theſe conformities among the proteſtant diſſenters, give them the advantage of alledging at leaſt, that for one convert to popery gained from them, there are hundreds won from the church of England.

* Thus "the Proteſtants burnt in Queen Mary's reign, were "guilty of Treaſon. The Gunpowder-conſpirators were few— "acted confeſſedly againſt catholic principles, and expreſſed their "ſorrow and repentance for it at their execution. In the Iriſh "Maſſacre none but the loweſt claſs of people were guilty of the "cruelties complained of on that occaſion." But as theſe were facts upon which our *Conſiderer* could not wholly depend, he has another ſtring to his bow, and, according to former precedents, "aſcribes the Powder-plot to the artifice of Cecil, the Iriſh Rebellion "to the frenzy of men made deſperate by the oppreſſions of civil "government, and the Tyranny of James II. to the counſels of "Lord Sunderland." But the pinch of the caſe lay here: All theſe attempts for the ſuppreſſion of hereſy were, in the event, unſucceſsful, ſave only that of Queen Mary, and ſhe acted by law. "The principal perſons who ſuffered in Queen Mary's reign," ſays this gentleman, "might have been puniſhed for *high treaſon*, "but ſhe choſe to have them condemned for *hereſy*, that ſo the "puniſhment might fall on thoſe *ſhe deemed* the enemies of the Al"mighty, rather than conſider them as offenders againſt herſelf "and the ſtate," p. 20. SHE *deemed!* Did not the church *deem* them ſo too? were not the laws ſtill in force againſt hereſy in this kingdom? are not the laws ſtill in force in all roman catholic countries againſt hereſy founded upon the ſame principle? "But Car"dinal Pole—diſappoved of all violent proceedings." Why then did he not put a ſtop to them? (for he certainly had it in his power.) And what does this prove, but that, whatever the natural diſpoſition of the man might be, the principles of holy church admit of no lenity in caſes of hereſy; and the principles of holy church muſt be

indeed hardly be otherwise with any of them, when one considers the paradox they have to support, which is at the bottom neither more nor less than that *the penal laws against papists in* Great Britain *have for their object opinions purely religious, whereas what the protestants call persecution under popish governments, is nothing more than just and legal punishment for sedition, treason, and rebellion against the*

the principles of the prieſt.—" As all Engliſh catholics do at this " time," ſays this *Conſiderer*. But why *Engliſh* catholics? Are not Engliſh catholics of the ſame religion with *French*, *Spaniſh*, *Italian*, *German*, *Iriſh* Catholics? Have they different notions of hereſy, or different ſentiments of the authority of the church by which hereſy is defined and cenſured? If ſo, what becomes of the unity of the church?—But here again the reaſon is at hand; if Engliſh catholics were to avow their approbation of violent proceedings, their wickedneſs might come to fall on their own pate, as it hath done on former occaſions. But what does this gentleman mean by *violent proceedings?* When Lewis XIV was dragooning his proteſtant ſubjects into the catholic faith, by all the barbarities implied in that expreſſive word, the French writers had the aſſurance to affirm, that all their converſions were made by *methods of lenity and ſweetneſs*, and that no ſeverities were uſed upon thoſe occaſions. Among others, Boſſuet biſhop of Meaux. aſſerted this in a paſtoral letter to the new converts of his dioceſe in 1685. But, glaring and notorious matters of fact having given the lie to his repreſentation, it was expected that he would expunge that paſſage in the 2d edition of the ſaid letter. " They write from Paris," ſays Mr. Bayle, " that Mr. de Meaux will cancel, in the 2d edition of his paſtoral " letter, the paſſage where he ſays to the new catholics of his dioceſe, " *that they have ſuffered no violence in their goods or in their perſons*, and that he has heard other biſhops ſay the ſame thing." *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres*, juin. 1616. p. 736. Inſtead of this the biſhop, in another piece, publiſhed ſoon after, ſolemnly called God to witneſs, that he had, in that paſtoral letter, ſpoken nothing but the truth. (See Bower's Summary View, p. 149.) Which is no otherwiſe to be underſtood, conſiſtently with the credit and veracity of this catholic prelate, but by ſuppoſing that in his ideas the methods of dragooning were not methods of violence. In what high eſtimation the biſhop of Meaux's ſentiments are held by the Engliſh

state. No wonder that, in the support of these propositions, they should be driven to the necessity of misreporting and misrepresenting facts and characters on both sides, and contradicting each other in blackening on the one hand, and varnishing on the other, the men and things which fall in their way.

But, in truth, the best of these writers were but under-workers, employed occasionally to smooth the road, and to open a more disembarrassed and expeditious passage for their capital work,—The Life of *Reginald Pole*, by Father *Philips*; who, in order to magnify his hero,

catholics, hath appeared in many of their late publications; we shall therefore do them no wrong in supposing their ideas of *violent proceedings* to be the same with those of this Prelate. But the point this writer wants to infuse into the present generation, without any proof but a few examples of changes of sentiments in similar cases, is the tender affection the catholics have for his present Majesty. It is a great pity he did not bring, as an instance of it, their republishing *the True-born Englishman*, with the decorations above-mentioned. One of his arguments is as follows: "Not many years "ago, one of the universities was branded with the charge of being "paved with Jacobites; and yet, in how high a degree of royal "favour do the members of that body seem to stand at present?" Well, and what then? Why then, "there are many other instan-"ces of the like changes." Therefore, I suppose, the roman catholics ought to stand in an equally high degree of royal favour. Have then the roman catholics changed their political sentiments, as he insinuates the members of the university to have done? That, with all his flourishes "of the sensibility of his Majesty's roman "catholic subjects, of his goodness, clemency, and moderation," he ventures not to assert. There is no consequence then to be drawn from this supposed parallel case, in favour of the roman catholics; and the only use he could possibly make of the instance he here brings, would be the supposition, that the university seems to stand in this hign degree of royal favour, without changing her political sentiments. And whether this would be a more decent compliment to his Majesty's government or to the university, the reader will judge. Upon the whole, all insinuations of their affection to

and his coadjutors in the sacred cause of the church, makes not the least scruple to calumniate every person and every measure that contributed to the protestant reformation.

his Majesty's person and government, are but mere pretence, while his Majesty's religion lies with them under the imputation of heresy, and that heresy is excluded by the church from toleration. This writer endeavours indeed to represent this matter otherwise, and tells us, p. 3, that, "except in the extremities of Europe, Spain, "and Sweden, the benign spirit of moderation is gaining ground." Unfortunate apologist! the vengeance so lately attempted to be taken on Mr. Marmontel in France, by the doctors of the Sorbonne, for his noble sentiments on toleration, in the 15th chapter of his *Belisarius*, too visibly confute the supposition. "Mr. Marmontel, "say the accounts from Paris, in a letter to the archbishop, offered "to retract it [this 15th chapter] if necessary; but the divines "are inexorable, and are determined on proceeding against him." *London Chronicle*, April 4, 1767. Will our *Considerer* tell us, that these are bigots, who act both against reason and principle? Hardly; for they are priests, and their authority is sacred with every one of their persuasion, even by the confession of this very writer. For in answer to those who ridicule the papists for sacrificing their reason to the authority of the priest, he does not deny the charge, but apologizes for it thus: "In this they (the papists) act "much in the same manner as the rest of mankind in their most im-"portant concerns; the client is directed by his lawyer in what re-"gards his property, and makes so little use of his reason, that the coun-"sellors frequently do not alledge the motives on which they found "their opinions. How blindly do the wisest men follow the advice "of the physician, when their health and life itself is at stake? Why "should those alone be ridiculous, who, in matters of religion consult "that order of men, who are supposed to have made that the study "and business of their lives; and they, as the learned bishop of Meaux "observes, are not to impose any new article of belief, but only to "inform their flock what was the doctrine of Christ and his Apos-"tles?" P. 10, 11. But how if the flock is not satisfied that the priests give this information faithfully? What hinders the flock from informing themselves in such a case, by a fair examination and comparison between the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles and the doctrines of the priests? To this we have no answer. But we must suppose these priests at least give this information with sincerity, and to the best of their judgment. Whence it will follow, that

On the other hand. Cardinal Pole's virtues being represented as the effect of his religious tenets, the man himself is to be considered as a perfect exemplar of the excellency of the roman catholic religion, which must of course be exculpated from all those horrid doctrines charged upon it by the protestants, as there was no trace of any such principles in the life and character of a man, who so well understood, and so strictly practised, whatsoever was prescribed by his religion.*

theſe prieſts of the Sorbonne, who are for proſecuting Mr. Marmontel, are perſuaded that *intolerance* is a doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and that the doctrine of *moderation* is a downright *hereſy*.

* There is ſomething extremely remarkable in the circumſtances attending the firſt appearance of this hiſtory. "The title page, we "are told, proclaims its publication at Oxford; and from this cir- "cumſtance many an unwary reader hath been led to imagine that "it came out *juſſu* or *permiſſu ſuperiorum*."—But the true account we have of this matter is as follows. "The work, prepared for "the preſs, was in form brought to the Vice-chancellor, and ſub- "mitted to his inſpection; by his order it was peruſed and examined; "it was cenſured and rejected as a production unfit to receive the "ſanction of our univerſity preſs.——But Mr. Philips, ſeeming "reſolved that Oxford ſhould not be deprived of the intended honour, "gains an eaſy acceſs to another preſs in the city, where no *impri-* "*matur* or approbation was required: in this manner the work "came into the world." See the Preface to *Papiſts and Phariſees compared*, by JOHN BURTON, D. D. The Vice-chancellor not having authority over this other preſs, the univerſity are doubtleſs well juſtified from any ſuſpicion of giving countenance to this publication. The matter is indeed ſo left in this apology, as if it ſtill was at father Philips's option where his book ſhould be publiſhed. I have been informed, however, upon pretty good authority, that the author would not have gained eaſy acceſs to any preſs in Oxford, but through the intereſt of a patron ſince deceaſed, whoſe connexions with Philips laid him under ſome groundleſs imputations of dying in communion with the church of Rome. As to the book itſelf, it hath received anſwers from ſeveral learned pens, which have attacked it with ſucceſs, but from none with more execution than the compilers of the *Critical Review*, for June 1764, and

As the hopes and expectations of the papists about the time this work was published were not generally known, it was a matter of surprize to the public, whence the roman catholics, who for some time past had affected to express their deference for the present government, should derive the assurance to calumniate the protestant reformation in so open and profligate a manner. It was not long, however, that we were suffered to remain in this state of suspense. It was published by the roman catholics about that time, that encouragement was given them to hope that so considerable a mitigation of the penal laws against them would speedily take place, as would amount to a full toleration.*

January 1765, who close their strictures with the following just remark. "The world has seen many groundless, impudent "apologies for a church or a state in full possession of power, with- "out the author's designing to authenticate the facts; but this history "of Cardinal Pole is the most impudent as well as ill-judged insult "that ever was offered to the understanding of a people, among "whom papists are now under legal disabilities."

* To their boasting of this I can speak with the more certainty, as I had an instance of it myself, in return to a message I had sent to a busy priest stationed in my own parish, and who had said to my face, upon a former expostulation, that, "since the government thought "proper to make no inquiries who frequented their worship, he did "not see what business I had with it." To this I could only reply, "that I did not wonder a *jesuit* should think it *his* business to con- "vert my *heretical* parishioners to popery, and that it was not *my* "business to interfere with him; but that I apprehended a protestant "government must have different notions of our respective provin- "ces." I must own that some things have been incautiously enough thrown out in the newspapers, as well as in publications of other sorts, as if the assiduity of popish emissaries might well pass, without the notice or the concern of the public, upon account of the little success they have had in making converts; and possibly the priest above-mentioned, and others of his class, might conclude from such intimations, that government would connive at them, whatever

What grounds they had for this presumption is likely enough to remain a secret, as some of those upon whom the accomplishment of these expectations was said to depend, were soon after out of a condition to keep their word with them, if ever they gave it; and, if ever they gave it, it ought to be the daily prayer of every faithful subject of his Majesty, that none of the same spirit and principles may ever be in a condition to make it good.

It is natural however, for men, even after their disappointments, to hang upon a flattering prospect as long as ever the least glimpse of it remains in sight, and to amuse themselves with hopes, that the obscurity which for the present intercepts it may at some favourable crisis, once more clear off: and with this persuasion, it was not at all accountable that the papists should still keep on foot the arguments in favour of the toleration they desire, by way of prepossessing the public mind, against the time when the project may be revived with success. And this doubtless is the motive upon which we have been entertained, of late, with

lengths they should go. They have by this time, I suppose, found their mistake. His Majesty's protestant subjects, I trust, will never consider the article of proselyting their fellow-protestants to popery as a matter of indifference, nor will their governors in church and state be inattentive to their apprehensions of this sort, when there shall appear sufficient grounds for them, notwithstanding the impatience of the roman catholics under such controul; of which they have just now given us a specimen, with as much additional provocation, by abusing and misrepresenting our protestant reformation, as can be crowded into a pamphlet of 172 pages, intituled, *An Apology for the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, humbly offered to the Consideration of the King's Most Excellent Majesty, and both houses of Parliament:* which is just come to my hands.

still more of these ingenious essays from roman catholic pens.

In the mean time, it becomes us to be upon our guard against every attempt (however speciously coloured) of a vigilant and insidious adversary, whose malignant intentions towards our religion and government will admit of no doubt. It may not therefore be unseasonable to take a cursory view of those pretensions to toleration, which the papists are now setting up, and which may, not improbably, make impressions upon those who meet with a new argument in favour of a popular error, when and where the refutation of it is not at hand. And as the papists ground their claim to be tolerated in this country upon protestant principles, it will be necessary to begin with examining into the grounds of the doctrine of toleration, as it is expounded and professed among protestants, such of them, at least, as adhere to their original principles of reformation.

The plea of our forefathers for separating from the church of Rome was, that doctrines, forms of worship, and terms of communion, were imposed upon the members of that church, which were not only not prescribed in the scriptures, but were such as, in many instances, were plainly condemned by the word of God contained in those scriptures.

Upon that occasion the scriptures were declared to be the only authentic rule of religion to christians; and accordingly all the protestant churches, as soon as they were formed, took care, in their public confessions, to reserve to the written word of God the exclu-

sive honour of deciding all controversies, whether concerning points of faith, or circumstances of worship and discipline, that might arise among them.

This common principle set all protestant churches, with respect to matters merely religious, upon a level. It gave indeed every *man*, as well as every *church*, a right to examine, judge, and determine for himself, what he ought to believe as necessary to salvation, and in what manner to worship God most acceptably to that end. A protestant church, which had made a general appeal to the scriptures for the truth of religion, in opposition to the pretended authority of the church of Rome, could not find fault with any private protestant who should go to the same scriptures, either for his creed or his ritual, even though what he should, after examination, espouse of this kind, should differ from the creed or the ritual of that particular church. In such a case, compulsive measures to procure his conformity to the majority would be most absurd and inconsistent, and could have no better effect than either to make the man an hypocrite, or expose him to censures and penalties, which no protestant church had more right to inflict than the church of Rome.

And if this was the case where only the liberty of a private christian came in question, much more absurd and inconsistent would measures of compulsion be, when different churches and societies should be in disagreement with each other upon points of religious controversy. It could indeed hardly be, but that one side must be erroneous, and found their

doctrines or their discipline on some mistaken sense of scripture ; but still the scriptures were the last resource of both ; and therefore neither side could, upon the sole consideration of their being, in their own judgment, the more orthodox, proceed to molest or censure the other on account of their dissent, without deserting the original protestant principle, or indeed without justifying the church of Rome for persecuting those who opposed her decisions, even with the plainest evidence of scripture before them.

Thus stood the case with protestant churches considered as societies merely religious. But as, in process of time, whole kingdoms and states separated from the church of Rome, and adopted the general principles of the first reformers, and as, in consequence of this separation, it was thought necessary to give the main body of protestants in every such kingdom or state the face and character of an *established* church, it became farther necessary for that purpose, to take in the civil magistrate as a party, to give a sanction to such ordinances as were intended to regulate the religious discipline of a numerous society, united in one common religious profession.

And here began the question concerning mutual toleration. The establishment of one mode of worship, and of one sett of doctrinal propositions by the sanctions of civil authority, implied the exclusion of all the rest. The excluded sects would of course fall under several civil incapacities ; at least under a deprivation of every privilege appropriated by the civil magistate to those who conformed to the establish-

ment ; and so far as this was the case, the common protestant principle namely, that *the scriptures are the final resort in all questions concerning religion*, would seem to be deserted. It did not satisfy dissenters to say, that, the settlement of doctrinal points being first left to churchmen and divines, the civil magistrate no farther interfered than to give his solemn approbation of them, and for the rest undertook only to regulate external forms, and things indifferent in themselves, for the sake of order and decency. The dissenters from the establishment constantly remonstrated, that churchmen or divines, as such, had no more right to settle points of doctrine for all the people, than the civil magistrate ; that *settling points of doctrine* was only another phrase for *interpreting the scriptures*, and that to take from the people the right of interpreting the scriptures for themselves, amounted in effect to the taking from them the use of the scriptures.

With respect to the modes of worship, and external ceremonies, the question was, not what the civil magistrate in his judicial or legislative capacity thought of their indifference, or of their conducing to order and decency; but what the dissenter thought of them when examined by the scriptural rules of discipline and edification. If, in the judgment of the dissenter, the established forms or modes of worship, or discipline, were inconsistent with those rules laid down in the scriptures, it was not the approbation of the civil magistrate that could authorize the dissenter's compliance with them. Private conscience in such cases be-

comes a party, the judgment on which God hath reserved for his own tribunal.

History informs us, that in the progress, and indeed in the beginning of the reformation in some countries, these considerations were too frequently over-ruled, and the authority of the civil magistrate improperly, not to say unwarrantably, interposed. In which impropriety they were too often abetted and justified by protestant divines, even so far as to give countenance to many detestable acts of persecution, which stand recorded in authentic history, to their great reproach. Every man of plain sense might see that these divines could not be justified in their own separation from the roman church, but on account of hardships and impositions of the very same sort with those they now obtruded on their protestant brethren. And, to speak impartially, the miserable quibbles which have been employed by different protestant communions, to distinguish one of these cases from the other, have done nothing more for the *men*, than to leave suspicions upon their sincerity; or for their *cause*, than to shew what plausible colours may be put upon the *very worst*, by ingenious and interested advocates.

In these latter times, the doctrine of religious liberty has been more generally understood and more kindly entertained than heretofore; and though it cannot be denied that there are still remaining, in some protestant communities, many unwarrantable restraints and incumbrances upon protestant dissenters from the established system, yet it must be acknowledged, that the original protestant principle

of mutual toleration hath recovered its credit, particularly in our own country, to a greater degree than could have been expected. And though this principle hath not yet operated to the full and effectual relief of all those conscientious dissenters who are intitled to it, yet it must be allowed, that the liberty they now enjoy of professing and practising their respective opinions and discipline, is such as they who contrived the bulwarks of ecclesiastical establishment in protestant states, vehemently condemned, and, had they lived in these times, would have opposed with all their power and interest.

The notion that misled our forefathers in this matter was, that, if more than one form of religion should be tolerated in a country where only one form of civil government was established, some disorder and confusion would ensue, pernicious to the peace and welfare of civil society; and no wonder, where the civil magistrate was so persuaded, that such an apprehension should make deep impressions upon him.

Churchmen indeed went upon other principles. Taking the word, church, in a certain sense, they concluded, it must have authority to judge and censure erroneous opinions, under the name of heresy; differing herein from the popish doctrine on this head, in nothing but in their account of the constitution of the church to which they ascribed this authority, and such limitation of her powers, as excluded infallibility, rather perhaps in words and declarations, than in reality. On another hand, they imagined that schism, with respect to

matters of discipline, was so precise and obvious an idea, that they made no scruple to class it at the head of those immoral offences which were understood to be the proper objects of ecclesiastical correction.

With these reasons, alledged by the ecclesiastical powers for reserving to themselves the punishment of heresy and schism, the civil magistrate had little to do, so long as civil society did not suffer by these supposed offences. But being persuaded, by artful and ambitious ecclesiastics, that heresy and schism were crimes which struck at the foundations of civil government, as well as at the peace and prosperity of the church, and having no experience of the benefits arising to the state from the free toleration of opinions and modes of worship which had no evil influence upon the commerce of civil society, the civil magistrate interposed, and gave his sanction to the claims of church authority to inflict penalties and censures on heretics and schismatics; and had heresy and schism been the dangerous frightful things to civil government they were represented to be, he would have rightly interposed. But this was not the case, nor indeed could it be known *a priori* that it ever would be the case, till some overt acts of heresy or schism had disturbed the civil peace and order of the community under his protection, which however he would have no reason to fear, while no religious society pretended to more than the full and free exercise of their christian liberty in matters of faith and worship.

But then, on the other hand, whenever, under the pretence of conscience and religion,

men, whether dissenters from the establishment or not, professed such principles and avowed them by their practices, as manifestly broke in upon the peace and due regulations of civil society, the magistrate would then interpose his authority with the highest propriety. The same scriptures which reserve to the christian his right of private judgment in matters purely religious, reserve likewise to the civil magistrate his right of punishing evil-doers. The same scriptures which take the conscientious christian out of the hands of earthly judgment, with respect to his religious opinions and principles, by leaving him to stand or fall to his heavenly master alone, deliver him over to the civil justice of his country, the moment he takes occasion from his principles to break in upon the peace and righteousness of civil intercourse. The same scriptures indeed make it the duty of the magistrate to see that his subjects lead quiet and peaceable lives in *all honesty*, as well as in all godliness, and therefore can never be understood to countenance or abet the disturbers of public peace, or the transgressors of the known rules of righteousness, upon any pretended plea of conscience. The christian religion disclaims the province of regulating civil society, farther than that, by instilling good principles, and reforming the manners of individuals, it provides in the most effectual manner for the peace and welfare of societies made up of christian governors, and christian subjects; and for the rest, confines itself to its proper office of conducting men to a kingdom which is not of this world.

These several cases might be illustrated by a variety of examples from different histories. But there is one which seems to me more particularly apposite to the present purpose, as it refers to principles which were pretended to be derived from those of the protestant reformation. What I mean, is the case of the anabaptists in Germany.

The principal and distinguishing tenet of this sect was, *the invalidity of infant baptism*, and the necessity there was that their followers should be re-baptised, when they came to maturity, in order to make them qualified subjects of the kingdom of Christ. In support of this doctrine they alledged, the silence of the scriptures with respect to infant-baptism, and the incapacity of infants for making the necessary stipulations required on that solemn occasion. And upon these questions the controversy is kept on foot to this very time.

Had this denomination of dissenters conducted themselves as peaceable subjects of the state, and conformed themselves to the laws of that particular government under which they lived, and were protected in the enjoyment of their civil privileges, they would have been, upon the principles of the reformation, as much intitled to toleration in professing their peculiar doctrine, and practising the ordinances they grounded upon it, as any other protestants whatsoever.

It is of very little consequence to the civil magistrate whether a good subject has been baptised once or twice, or whether in his infancy, or when he came of age. This is a point which affects none but the man himself

in his religious capacity. And even whole societies might, upon this question, separate in public worship from other religious societies in the same civil community, without being wanting in any one duty incumbent on good citizens.

But when they, who first distinguished themselves by this religious opinion, proceeded to graft upon it doctrines which were immediately destructive of all civil authority, and began not only to oppose the magistrate, but to possess themselves of his power by violence, and to appropriate all earthly dominion to themselves, as the elect of God, and to pretend to derive their possession of it from him by immediate revelation; and under this pretence, to commit murders and other outrages upon their fellow-subjects;—when, I say, the matter came to these extremities, the principles of toleration were out of the question. No man's conscience, directed by the word of God, could lead him to these brutal and immoral acts; and the rulers of those particular states to whom these desperate enthusiasts gave this offence, were well jusified in their inflicting severe punishment upon such of their ringleaders, as were the authors and instigators of these unjustifiable acts of rebellion and public mischief.*

* Vide Sleidan. *Comment. lib. X. fub initio et alibi. Bayle's Dictionary*, Art. ANABAPTISTS, and many others. It is not indeed to be denied that fome religioniſts of this denomination were inhibited and ſeverely treated by the civil powers, in ſome other places, particularly in *Switzerland*, when their tenets were at leaſt of a more peaceable ſort. The excuſe for this was, that their doctrines were ſtill ſuch as in fact affected the ſecurity of the ſtate. See

Let us now turn to the Roman catholics who live under our protestant government and

Bayle, u.f. Remark[L], where it appears that this apology was more plauſible in ſome ſtates than it was in others; and they who treated them as a people not to be tolerated, muſt be condemned or juſtified by the nature and circumſtances of thoſe particular caſes, which came under their cognizance. See a fine paſſage of *Eraſmus*, concerning the abſurdity and iniquity of proteſtants puniſhing certain Anabaptiſts, in his Life by Dr. *Jortin*, vol. II. p. 276, and the juſt remark of the excellent biographer upon it. Be this as it may, it is certain that they who now are, and for above a century backwards have been, diſtinguiſhed by the name of *Anabaptiſts*, have intitled themſelves to equal toleration, not only by diſavowing the ſeditious doctrines of thoſe men who, under that denomination, fell into thoſe abominable extravagances at Munſter and elſewhere, but by profeſſing others, friendly, in the higheſt degree, to the peace and welfare of civil ſociety. I mention this the rather, as one of our Popiſh champions in the *Public Ledger* will needs have the caſe of the Papiſts, to be the ſame with that of the Baptiſts, alledging, that the latter had no more condemned the rebellious principles of their forefathers than the former. Now, not to mention the variety of ſects into which the Anabaptiſts have been divided, and in what reſpects they have differed each from the others, it is well known, that the moſt conſiderable body of them in the low countries coaleſced under the name of *Mennonites*, who formally diſowned the errors of particular ſectaries of that denomination in their public confeſſions. Even *George Caſſander*, a Popiſh writer, bore an honourable teſtimony in favour of the *Mennonites*, namely, that "they "had always moſt vehemently renounced the madneſs of the *Mun-* "*ſter* and *Battenburgh* enthuſiaſts, who meditated a reſtoration of "Chriſt's kingdom, which, as they ſaid, conſiſted in the deſtruction "of the wicked by external force." *Bayle*, u. f. Rem. [G]. But to give the objector the faireſt opportunity of judging how the caſe ſtands between the *Mennonites* or *Baptiſts* and his clients, I ſhall take the liberty to tranſcribe a curious paſſage from the article above-cited in Mr. *Bayle's* Dictionary, to which every reader, who may be edified or entertained by ſo fine an anecdote, may not have acceſs. "Mr. *De Turenne*" (who, by the way, had turned from the Proteſtant to the Popiſh communion) "being one day in a coach "with Mr. *Van Beuning*, expreſſed his diſlike to him at the to- "leration which the States General granted to all ſorts of religions. "What Mr. *Van Beuning* anſwered on behalf of the *Mennonites*

consider how far their conduct and principles intitle them to the toleration for which they plead.

" was as follows: why are you averſe to the toleration of this ſect? " They are very honeſt people, and the moſt eaſy in the world; " they never aſpire to employments; they thwart no man's ambiti- " on; they traverſe no man's views by competition or intrigues. It " were to be wiſhed, that in every country half the people would " make a conſcience of aiming at dignities; the other half would ar- " rive at them with leſs difficulty, and without employing ſo many " mean arts and unlawful methods. We have no reaſon to appre- " hend the rebellion of a ſect, one of whoſe articles of faith is, that " it is unlawful to bear arms. How great a ſecurity is it to a ſove- " reign to know that his ſubjects are reſtrained by ſuch a bridle, " whatever impoſts or tallage is laid upon them? The *Mennonites* " contribute their ſhare to the charges of the government. This is " ſufficient. With this we levy troops, which are more uſeful to us " than theſe people would be, were they to enliſt themſelves. They " edify us by the ſimplicity of their manners; they apply themſelves " to arts and buſineſs, without ſquandering away their own patrimo- " ny, or the wealth they acquire, in luxury and vice. Other com- " munions behave differently. Voluptuouſneſs and the expences " of vanity, are, in them, a conſtant ſource of ſcandal, and a wea- " kening of the ſtate. But they refuſe to ſwear. A mighty mat- " ter indeed! The authority of the tribunals receives no prejudice " thereby. Theſe people think themſelves as much obliged by an " affirmation of the truth, as they could be by an oath. All the uſe " of adminiſtring an oath conſiſts in this, that the perſon who violates " it is in fear of being more ſeverely puniſhed by God, and expoſes " himſelf to infamy, and even corporal puniſhment from men. The " *Mennonites* fear the ſame conſequences if they violate their affir- " mation; they are therefore bound by the ſame obligation with other " men." Will any man pretend to give the like amiable character of papiſts in any proteſtant country wherever they reſide? I know it hath been ſaid, that the papiſts in Holland have always demeaned themſelves as peaceable and even dutiful ſubjects to the government of the States General, and with the ſame affections to the common cauſe of the country, as other diſſenters from the eſtabliſhed religion; and this has been made an argument for granting them as full and free a toleration in Great Britain as they enjoyed in the United Provinces. This, however, hath not always been the caſe, as appears by the following particulars. In the year 1646, Cardinal

If the only objections we have to papists were that they hold—*Transubstantiation, pur-*

Mazarin formed a project of giving up *Catalonia* (then in the hands of the French) to the Spaniards, in exchange for the Low Countries and the county of Burgundy. But as this exchange would have thrown advantages into the hands of France, which could not fail to give umbrage to those who were the nearest neighbours to these countries, particularly England and the United provinces, it was quite necessary for the cardinal to obviate such objections as might arise from the consideration of the weight this exchange would have thrown into the scale of France. The advantage of this exchange to the United Provinces, he pretended, would be, that, "they would "no longer have occasion to be at the excessive expence of keeping "up a barrier on the frontier of the Spanish Netherlands, as France "would form no pretensions to their country, as the Spaniards, from "whom they had formerly revolted, would always do; on another "hand he pleads, that the United Provinces might then place more "confidence in the catholics among them, to the mutual advantage "of both parties, the catholics in those provinces *being persecuted*, "*not so much through the hatred borne to their religion, as from* "*being partisans and adherents to the Spaniards.*" *Le Clerc, Bibl. Choisie. Tom. XX. p.* 34. 35. So then we see the States General have not always thought it good policy to tolerate the papists in the same degree as they did other sects. In the mean time it is a noble testimony borne by a popish cardinal to the religious moderation of the protestant states, namely, that they did not subject the catholics to penalties on account of their religion, but *pour être tenus (et cela avec raison) affectionnes et adherens au parti d'Espagne.* That is, in plain terms, for being rebels to the state. "But," saith "*Le Clerc*, did not this able politician see, that these catholics, in "case of the exchange, would have become suspected of favouring "France, and that the States would have looked upon them with so "much the more aversion, as the fear of France would have been "greater than the States had then of Spain?" The pretensions of Spain and the house of Austria to the United Provinces hath long since ceased. Since when, the only catholic power they have had to fear, is France. How the Dutch papists have behaved since this alteration took place, I pretend not to know. But, if what Sir *William Temple* said of them, when he wrote his *Observations on the United Provinces*, namely, that, "they have neither given any disturbance "to the government, nor expressed any inclinations to a change, or "to any foreign power," continue still to be true of them, they have

gatory, saint-worship, the proper sacrifice of Christ in the mass, or some other doctrines merely religious, wherein the papists differ from protestants, the former would be intitled to toleration, on the same footing with other dissenters from the established church. These doctrines, abstracted from the authority on which the Roman catholics support and inforce them, might be professed and practised, by persons who might still be good subjects to the state. They might pretend scriptural authority for these doctrines, strange and absurd as they are, and adhere to them on that pretence only. As matters of private opinion, or if you will, of conscience, they would be no more obnoxious to the magistrate than other harmless peculiarities which distinguish one sect from another.

But when we find that the papists ground these doctrines on the infallibility of the pope or the church of Rome, and pronounce all to be heretics who dissent from that church,—that they consider such heretics as *de jure* excluded from all civil and social as well as religious privileges,—that catholics are not obliged to keep faith with them, more particularly where their covenants with heretics interfere with the interests of their church,*—that any

certainly a title to toleration, which the papists of Great Britain as certainly have not.

* See Pope Clement XI's letter to the king of Spain, in the Appendix, No. II. which is decisive as to this point, and shews the consummate assurance of those late popish advocates who have denied this to be a tenet of the Roman church. For the present, I shall only consider it as a proof of popish intolerance, which, taken along with their annual anathemas denounced upon heretics; their Indexes of prohibited books (one of which was published by Benedict XIV.

cruelties or executions inflicted upon heretics convict, are sufficiently authorised by a com-

nn longer ago than the year 1758), and what has been attempted in France againſt Mr. Marmontel by the doctors of the Sorbonne, amounts to a demonſtration, that intolerance is the avowed principle of the Roman church in all countries, and under all governments. It hath been ſaid, and ſeems at preſent to be taken for granted, that proteſtant ſtates cannot, conſiſtently with proteſtant principles, exclude papiſts from the benefit of toleration, at leaſt on the ſcore of their religious principles and profeſſion. Perhaps we ſhall not be allowed to call intolerance a religious doctrine, as there is in it ſo deep a tincture of politics, and likewiſe as it muſt owe ſo much of its ſupport to the ſecular arm; the doctrines, however, upon which it is founded being manifeſtly ſuch, I ſhall beg leave to take that point for granted, and proceed to conſider, how far upon proteſtant principles, the papiſts (adhering ſtill to theſe doctrines) have a right to be tolerated in proteſtant communities. The proteſtant principle of free, equal, and mutual toleration may be conſidered under the notion of a covenant, wherein the tolerating churches, as contracting parties, agree to acknowledge each other's freedom and independency, and mutually to ſupport each other under the common protection of, and in ſubordination to the civil magiſtrate, in the full and abſolute enjoyment of their religious liberty. But a popiſh intolerant church can plead no right to be included in ſuch a covenant, upon any principles of equity whatſoever. And if the ſcriptures preſcribe to proteſtants the toleration of an intolerant church, it muſt be in ſome paſſages which equally conclude againſt chriſtians defending themſelves againſt their moſt inveterate and determined enemies. For the deſtruction of proteſtants is confeſſedly the aim and end of popiſh intolerance. This being premiſed, let us now conſider upon what grounds the plea for the toleration of popery in this country proceeds. "We do not conſider," ſays an ingenious and able writer, "that in ſuppreſſing a place of public worſhip, we are doing what "we certainly know to be unlawful, for the ſake of preventing what "we only ſuſpect to be dangerous." A little before, this apologiſt had called popery *a diabolical ſuperſtition*. *A diabolical ſuperſtition* may preſcribe and practice *the worſhip of the devil*. Now I cannot but apprehend that many an honeſt chriſtian magiſtrate may not certainly know, that it is not lawful for him to ſuppreſs a place where THE DEVIL IS PUBLICLY WORSHIPPED. It may be ſaid, that this is a caſe not to be ſuppoſed with reſpect to the papiſts. God forbid it ſhould, but it is nevertheleſs a caſe which comes within our advocate's plea. For he ſays, "the ſuppreſſing a place of pub-

mission from the pope or the church of Rome, —and that every papist is bound on the peril

" lic worſhip by authority, is committing an act of violence, and " breaking in upon the natural and unalienable right which every " man poſſeſſes, of worſhiping what and how he pleaſes." And conſequently of worſhipping the devil, if ſo he pleaſes, and, if ſo he pleaſes, with human ſacrifices. The reader will be pleaſed to obſerve, that this natural unalienable right is, according to our advocate, unlimited: he hath put no reſtriction upon it; nor indeed could he, without bringing the papiſt, in his preſent ſituation in this country, within it. He is well aware of this, and therefore thinks fit to repreſent, "that ſuppreſſing popiſh worſhip is in order to prevent " their aſſembling together for the purpoſe of propagating their " pernicious political principles." What! in their places of public worſhip?—Hardly. They are wiſer, and have other places for thoſe laudable purpoſes. And, I preſume, the magiſtrate too is wiſer than to give ſo ſilly a reaſon for his interfering. The magiſtrate finds himſelf directed by law to ſuppreſs places of popiſh public worſhip; and if you want any farther account of his proceedings, you muſt go to the reaſon of the law which prohibits the public worſhip of papiſts in Great Britain. And here you will find that the legiſlators were ſo much of philoſophers, at leaſt, as to diſcern that no man could have either a natural or an unalienable right to worſhip what and how and where he pleaſed, whoſe principle is to exterminate every ſect but his own; becauſe that man's religion would prevent his entering into any binding pacts, whether civil or religious, with thoſe who did not worſhip what and how this intolerant worſhiper pleaſed. Our advocate then ſhould have ſet out with proving that intolerance is not a principle of the Roman catholic religion; and this indeed he ſeems to inſinuate by calling for overt-acts in each individual for a proof of it. One would think it ſufficient to prove this, to appeal to the ſolemn deciſions of that ſociety to which ſuch individuals belong, to cite their avowed doctrines, and to ſhew that whenever they had the power in their hands, they have uniformly practiſed according to theſe doctrines. Indeed we need go no farther for our proof of this than our advocate himſelf, who informs us that "the principles of pure popery are calcu- " lated by ſatan their author to make this world an hell, and mankind " dæmons before their time." One would imagine that every act of joint-worſhip with ſuch a ſociety, but particularly every act of religious ſubmiſſion to the teachers of ſuch a ſociety, would be an overt-act ſufficient to determine the principles and intentions of every perſon who adheres to this ſociety. To obviate this, the gentleman

of damnation, to a strict obedience, and an implicit submission, to the dictates of the Pope

will have it, that the popiſh laity may be peaceably diſpoſed, though their prieſts are not; and aſks, "what avails the zeal of the prieſts, "without the people to follow them?" It were to be wiſhed that our proteſtant advocates for the toleration of popery would ſuffer the papiſts to plead their own cauſe, at leaſt till they are a little better acquainted with the popiſh arguments for it. For what ſay the papiſts to this ſuppoſition? Why, they make the implicit ſubjection of the laity to their prieſts an argument that the ſame laity would be implicitly ſubject to any form of civil government. Which of theſe ſuppoſitions ſhall we abide by? To ſuppoſe the layman would not follow the prieſt, is deſtroying Mr. Brook's argument for tolerating the papiſts; an argument which has the ſanction of the popiſh author of the *Conſiderations on the Penal Laws*, &c. To admit that the layman would implicitly follow his prieſt, is to make the queſtion of our proteſtant advocate beſide the purpoſe, as being founded on a falſe ſuppoſition. Of the ſame ſort is the intimation, that the papiſts are as little influenced by their principles as the reſt of mankind; whereas the whole force of the plea for their toleration, made uſe of by the popiſh writers above-mentioned, depends upon the ſuppoſition that they are more ſo. "Chriſtianity," ſays this gentleman, "does not any where, as I remember, authoriſe double "taxes on account of wrong opinions, religious or political, nor ever "draws its arguments from the fear of the conſtable." Why no, neither does chriſtianity authoriſe the window-tax, or the duty upon foreign imports. But neither does it diſallow them, as legal meaſures of ſupporting civil government. And if ſingle taxes are lawful in ſome caſes for the ordinary ſupport of civil government, without any prohibition from chriſtianity, double taxes are equally lawful in other caſes, where the ſafety and peace of the civil government equally require them. This then carries us back to the reaſon of impoſing theſe double taxes; and then the only proper queſtions will be, whether ſuch taxes are impoſed on religious or political conſiderations? Whether the perſons on whom they are impoſed are friends or enemies to the civil government which impoſes them? Whether, upon proper evidence that they are enemies, chriſtianity forbids the civil government to reſtrain their influence by ſuch means as double taxes? Queſtions which our advocate chuſes to keep out of ſight, and artfully enough throws in the term political opinions, as if equally unreſtrained by chriſtianity as opinions merely religious; and as if the object of double taxes were merely political ſpeculations, as harmleſs and inoffenſive to the proteſtant government of Great Bri-

and his church:—When these doctrines, I say, are added to their other tenets, it is evident that no protestant prince or state can be safe from the destructive practices of papists a moment longer than they are the weaker party; not to mention numberless mischiefs in a protestant community, which must arise from an intercourse with people thus principled, even while they are the weaker party.*

tain as opinions merely religious! The mention of the conſtable goes upon another inadmiſſable ſuppoſition, namely, that he is uſed as an inſtrument to convert the papiſts from their religious errors; a miſrepreſentation which may afford the gentleman occaſion to be facetious, but will ſurely do no credit to his candour as a reaſoner. He ſeems to think, that it makes a great deal for his cauſe, that "Chriſt never applied to a juſtice of the peace for a warrant to ſhut "up an heathen chapel, or to apprehend and impriſon a prieſt. Yet "Chriſt and his Apoſtles," ſays he, "not only ſuſpected, but knew "that their enemies ſought their blood and would have it; and they "knew the individuals, whoſe practice, not their ſpeculative prin-"ciples merely, were dangerous and deſtructive." Very well! what is now the concluſion? Why, this or nothing; "that this "precedent contains a prohibition to the chriſtian magiſtrate to take "any meaſures to reſtrain the power of an enemy, whoſe practices "he certainly knows would, without ſuch reſtraint, ſubvert the civil "as well as the religious conſtitution of the country over which he "preſides." Is this the doctrine of chriſtianity? If it is, I am ſure that one of our advocate's poſitions is antichriſtian, namely, that, "England ought to make no peace with France." For the goſpel precedent he brings will reach the one caſe equally with the other, and equally oblige the Britiſh government not only to be at perpetual peace with France, but to purchaſe that peace upon whatever conditions France ſhall pleaſe to preſcribe. There are other objections to this gentleman's theory, which I forbear to mention. I doubt not but he means well; and miſtakes which proceed from an exceſs of moderation and charity (which, I dare vouch, is the caſe of theſe of our advocate) are, of all others, the moſt excuſable, to ſay nothing of the very many valuable things to be met with in this ingenious writer's lucubrations on other ſubjects. See Crito, vol. II.

* The effects of popiſh bigotry among our common people is an evil of very pernicious tendency, and by no means ſufficiently at-

On these weighty and urgent considerations were the penal laws against the papists first en-

tended to, becauſe perhaps not generally underſtood. Some of the Roman Catholics affect, in promiſcuous company, to laugh at the influence the Proteſtants ſuppoſe their prieſts have upon them, and to treat this as a mere chimæra. There are doubtleſs profligates and libertines, who pay no regard to religion, among the papiſts as well as among the proteſtants. I ſpeak not of theſe, but of others, who will join with the gayeſt company in all the faſhionable diſſipations of the times, even to the very borders of libertiniſm, for which the proteſtant religion affords no atonement but a ſerious and effectual repentance and total converſion; and yet, in the midſt of all this, are as diligent and punctual in their attendance upon the minuteſt formalities, ſuch as going to confeſſion, keeping faſts and feſtivals, repeating their devotions, &c. as the moſt ſuperſtitious papiſt in the kingdom; and, what is more, as zealous and aſſiduous in making converts (where that can be managed without obſervation) as the prieſts themſelves. The roman catholics are taught, and are ready to teach others, that whatever liberties they take of this kind are atoned for by having recourſe to the peace of the church and that all offences are blotted out by abſolution, which they know well enough cannot be had without paying due deference to the pretended diſpenſers of it. Bigotry among papiſts of the lower ranks is more open, and without diſguiſe. Their zeal, unqualified with the artifices of a polite education, will not permit them to conceal the implicit faith they have in their prieſts, or to baulk themſelves in delivering the plain doctrines they learn from them (even the moſt abſurd in religion, and ſometimes the moſt treaſonable in politics), when in diſputation with proteſtants. What effect the open avowal of ſuch principles muſt have upon the lower claſſes of proteſtants, many of whom have neither been properly inſtructed, nor are of ſufficient capacity to cope with the ſubtlety and aſſurance of a popiſh prieſt, may eaſily be conjectured. They who become proſelytes to popery learn diſaffection to proteſtant government and the proteſtant religion by the ſame ſett of maxims; and even, it is to be feared, to undervalue the moſt ſolemn bonds of civil ſociety, when the intereſts of the church come in competition with them. Many are the inſtances of this kind that might be brought of the pernicious influence of popiſh bigotry upon our common people at this very period. It hath been often obſerved how remarkably uſeful the zeal and ſpirit of their female devotees have been to the popiſh prieſts in their grand buſineſs of proſelyting. At the beginning of the reformation the deſertion of ſo many monks afforded matter of much pleaſantry

acted, and afterwards revived and enlarged, not upon mere presumption that people who

to the popish writers, upon the supposition that the chief motive of their conversion was the liberty of entering into the married state; and I remember that among other invidious reasons given by the Jesuits for the conversion of the late Mr. Bower, one was, that *he was tired of lying alone*. It seems, however, that the papists, now that it will serve their own turn, have no objection to this matrimonial expedient of making converts. An honest plain countryman might be too phlegmatic to be wrought upon by an ingenious quibble, or too penetrating to be ensnared by a piece of jesuitical reasoning, who perhaps could not resist the temptation of a wife with a decent fortune, provided by his converters. Marriage has lately been the never-failing bait to many protestants, both men and women, to give up the religion of their bibles, for the idolatrous worship of the *Man of Sin*. In most cases the conversion has been made a previous condition. But where the protestant man or woman have been backward, the good work hath been left to be perfected by the catholic husband or wife, who have seldom failed to accomplish it by methods suggested to them by the directors of their consciences. Sometimes indeed all expedients have failed, and the protestant mate hath held fast his or her integrity in spite of all the cajolings or the menaces employed to seduce them. This firmness, however, hath brought upon such, particularly the poor women, a variety of ill usage, which, in one late instance I am about to transcribe from *The Gentleman's Magazine, for April*, 1766, ended fatally. "On Saturday the 5th of April "1766, William Whittle, condemned at Lancaster assizes for the "murder of his wife and two children, was executed on Lancaster "moor, and his body hung in chains. He was a roman catholic, "and confessed the fact. He was asked the motive for committing "so horrid a crime? He said, his priest told him, he should be "damned for marrying an heretic.—Why murder two innocent "children? His answer was, the mother had carried them to "church, so they would have been damned, if he had not killed "them; but now, he said, they were in purgatory, and would "go to heaven in due time. On this fellow's being hung up, the "Rev. Mr. Oliver, the clergyman who attended him" [this is a mistake, the Rev. Mr. Oliver of Preston was the magistrate who committed him to prison; the clergyman who attended him was the Rev. Mr. Leigh, curate of Lancaster, whose good offices however Whittle rejected, calling out for a priest of his own sort,] "received the following letter: Sir, I make bold to acquaint you "that your house, and every clergyman's that is in the town," (of

hold such principles might probably be seditious or rebellious in future times, when favour-

Preſton, near which the ſhocking fact was committed, and the criminal gibbeted), " or any black ſon of a b—h like you, for you are " nothing but heretics and damned ſouls:—If William Whittle, that " worthy man hangs up ten days, you may fully expect to be blown " to damnation. I have nothing more material, but I deſire you " will make intereſt for him to be cut down, or elſe you may fully " expect it at ten days end. My name is S. M. and W. G." See the *St. James's Chronicle, April* 15, 1766. Whittle, before this letter was made public, was ſpoken of as a ſtupid, bigotted, ignorant fellow, from whoſe behaviour no conſequences could be drawn to the diſadvantage of popery. For his bigotry, however, he himſelf accounted very ſatisfactorily, and from that account it appears, what laudable uſe the clergy of the church of Rome (who would not be thought either ſtupid or ignorant) occaſionally make of the ſtupidity and ignorance of thoſe who come under their direction. On the other hand, ſome of his own fraternity eſteemed him a worthy man, whoſe ſufferings were meritorious, and who was neither ſo ſtupid nor ſo ignorant as not to know, that the deſtruction of three heretics, at the price of one catholic martyr, was no bad bargain. I am far from believing that Whittle's prieſt ſpoke the ſenſe of every roman catholic prieſt in the kingdom; though, from inſtances of cruelty in a lower degree inflicted upon proteſtant wives by popiſh huſbands, which have occurred, and ſome within my own knowledge, one would be apt to ſuſpect that ſuch methods of converſion are but too generally encouraged by them: particularly if what a popiſh advocate in the Gazetteer ſaid of them, ſome time in October laſt, is true, viz. " That a romiſh prieſt in a proteſtant " country, may proſecute his intereſted and ambitious views, at the " expence of his religion, when he thinks fit." I am likewiſe perſuaded that there are many lay-papiſts in the kingdom who abhor this fact of Whittle as much as any proteſtant can do. But if their religion does not give countenance to ſuch doctrines as this alledged by this miſerable man, why do they not by ſome public act diſavow their approbation of them? why do they leave ſuſpicions upon themſelves and their religion by their ſilence, when ſuch occaſions call upon them ſo preſſingly to explain themſelves, and particularly when they are complaining of the ſeverity of the penal laws, for which ſurely there is no room, if ſuch are the principles of papiſts in general? Here the aforeſaid advocate ſteps in, and tells us, " that the " papiſts have no preſſes at command, and are obliged to ſend abroad " even for their books of devotion." The contrary of which is

able occasions offered; but upon the evidence of facts, and the repeated experience of their

notoriously known, even from so many of their libels, some of them mentioned above, namely, the Life of Cardinal Pole, Considerations on the Penal Laws, the True-born Englishman, &c. &c. About a century and a half ago, protestants made a conscience of intermarrying with papists, and very few were, in those days, so unequally yoked. But King Charles I. having set the example, these scruples have vanished away, and, as my author hath it, " since that " example, the devout and holy women of the popish communion " have been its most useful advocates and supports. They have " been and are eminently so in our days." He proceeds to shew by what means; and concludes with an account of one faculty or privilege, among several others, granted by his superiors to one John Laker, an english priest, about the year 1680, which the said author observes, " must have been of great and comfortable im- " portance in fixing the adherence of the ladies, &c. See a pamphlet, published in 1748, intituled, *An Enquiry into the Behaviour of our great Churchmen since the Reformation in the enacting and executing of Penal Laws against Papists and Protestant Dissent rs,* pages 36, 37, 38. It hath been often wished that the legislature would take this affair of protestants intermarrying with papists into serious consideration. That the papists gain great advantages over the protestants by these intermarriages, in point of conversions, is notorious. By what means, is set forth in the pamphlet above referred to; the chief of which perhaps is a sort of influence thrown into the hands of popish priests too indelicate to be mentioned here, and too indecent to be employed by a protestant minister, who is to conduct himself according to the purity as well as the truth of the christian religion. If the protestant settlement of the crown is of any consequence to the happiness of Great Britain, the methods taken by its internal enemies to undermine it, even in the minutest instances, ought not to be matters of indifference to the guardians of the public welfare. The article now under consideration would not misbecome the particular attention of our worthy pastors upon the episcopal bench. They may easily be in possession of very interesting matters of fact relating to these intermarriages; and if there is nothing in the legal course of ecclesiastical discipline that may prevent the pernicious consequences of such alliances to the state, they may have audience, where their wisdom and dignity will effectually give weight to their remonstrances, and sufficiently recommend such remedies for this growing evil, as might put a seasonable stop to it. The same may be said of the pernicious influence of popish bigotry upon the protestant vulgar, in other instances of civil intercourse.

perpetual plots and machinations against the government, from the first moment that the British throne was filled by a protestant prince.

Pope Pius Vth began with queen Elizabeth in 1569, whom he excommunicated, and, as far as in him lay, deprived of the allegiance of her subjects, by absolving them from the obligation of their oaths, and anathematising such as continued in their obedience to her government: by which she was left to the mercy of the first ruffian who could find the means to execute the vengeance of his holiness in a more effectual manner than would be done by merely fixing the rescript to the gate of the Vatican. The bull is preserved by bishop Burnet, and, by the tenor of it, it appears, that as Queen Elizabeth's protestant successors have offended the holy see in the same articles, they must of course be liable to the same sentence.* How far the principles on which this bull was founded operated upon the papists of those days, the religious designation of the Spanish Armada, and the frequent plots and conspiracies of the good catholics of that reign, are indisputable evidence.

The next four princes were of the Stuart family, but sprung, by the mother's side, from

* See Hist. Reform. Vol. II. Collection of Records, part II. book iii. No. 13. the last in the volume. Sixtus the Vth published another Bull in 1587, by which he gave away Queen Elizabeth's kingdoms to the first that should seize them. "This, says Rapin, "was the king of Spain, who was ready to make an advantage of "the Pope's kind offer." This kind offer was indeed implied in Pius's bull, though not so expressly mentioned. But the kingdom being taken from Elizabeth, must be given to somebody, and Mary Queen of Scots was just as ready to accept of it as Philip was afterwards.

the stock of the leaguing Dukes of Guise, the bitterest and most unrelenting persecutors of the protestants that history has recorded. The two first of them indeed were educated in the protestant religion, but not without an early bias in favour of popery, which grew upon them, in proportion as they came to observe that the principles of that religion were most favourable to the exercise of arbitrary power, and were accordingly, on many occasions, avowed by them, and were indeed the rather applicable to those occasions, as they esteemed large bodies of their protestant subjects to be little less heretics for dissenting from *their* church than the papists esteemed all other protestants to be for separating from the church of Rome. Other occasions and exigencies, however, arising, and the temper of their parliaments and people being totally averse to the papists, as the determined enemies of the civil constitution, and infamous corrupters of religion, the first of these princes was given to understand, that "he could not "tolerate popery without a parliament, unless "he would let his subjects see, that he took "unto himself the liberty to throw down the "laws of the land at his pleasure."* Charles, his successor, ventured to let his subjects see this at all hazards, but with very ill success. In the mean time, the papists, according to custom, considered the favourable disposition of these princes with very little gratitude. It was sufficient that their schemes were disap-

* See Archbishop Abbot's Letter to James I, in Rushworth, vol. I. p. 85.

pointed; and supposing that a change of government would re-establish their religion, they pursued that grand point through both these reigns by the most wicked plots and practices, without the least regard either to the reputation or safety of these deluded princes, who ventured so much in shewing their friendly disposition towards them.*

* James came to England from professing a religion and governing a people the most contrary and averse to popery. With these he was obliged to chime in, while he was among them, even so far as to express his contempt for the church of England for retaining some ceremonies which passed in Scotland for remnants of popish superstition. The papists were not aware of his versatile dispositon and how easily he might be wrought upon by proper instruments to make matters easy to them, and therefore determined to make sure work at the beginning of his reign, by the gun-powder conspiracy. These were the sentiments of such of them at least as pushed on the plot in concurrence with the court of Rome, whatever intimations the more moderate papists at home might have of his inclination to serve their cause. See *Casaubon's Epistle to Fronto Ducæus*, No. 624. edit 1656. When the prosecutions of jesuits and popish priests were set on foot, though, it was well known, without the the King's cordial consent, Sir Dudley Carleton apprized the King, that he " had intelligence in Spain, that the priests were comforting " themselves with this, that if he went on against them, they would " soon get rid of him." *Burnet, Hist. O. T. Vol. I. p.* 11. The Irish massacre, without inquiring how far it was or was not encouraged by King Charles I, is sufficient to prove the wicked practices of papists, and to characterise the spirit of popery during his reign, even though we should consign to disregard and oblivion some, otherwise atrocious, attempts of the Queen and her partizans to introduce popery among our forefathers of that day. It has been mentioned, in order to exculpate the dissenters from the church of England particularly the presbyterians, from the guilt of having had any hand in the death of Charles I, that this event was chiefly brought about by the papists, and particularly that one or more jesuits were seen about the scaffold in the garb of soldiers, with drawn swords, and were observed to express their joy as soon as the fatal blow was given, by waving their hats, &c. I own, I could never see what end the death of Charles I, could answer to the papists, unless they were in the secret of the son's religion, and imagined

The two latter, namely Charles the II. and James II. were papists themselves, the former secretly, the latter openly.

Charles loved his ease and pleasures too well, to embroil himself with his people so far as the popish party would have engaged him; who were so disgusted with his indolence, and so impatient to accomplish their favourite project of rooting out heresy in England, and planting popery in its room, that several attempts were made to remove this prince out of the way, in which, as it is credibly reported, they were at length successful.*

that the immediate reſtoration of that prince muſt be the conſequence of taking his father out of the way. And even then the ſtate of the nation was ſuch at that time, that the papiſts muſt have wanted common ſenſe if they could not have perceived that it was impoſſible, even for a profeſſed papiſt upon the throne, to do more for them than King Charles I, had done, or was willing to do. That the preſbyterians were not acceſſary to the King's death, that the moſt reſpectable of them oppoſed and would have prevented it, is notorious from the moſt authentic remains of hiſtory. It could therefore be of no real ſervice to them, to throw the odium of it upon the papiſts. They were fairly acquitted of having any hand in that cataſtrophe, and after that it could not at all concern their reputation who were or who were not the authors or the abettors of it. If any one is curious to ſee the particulars of this charge upon the papiſts, he may conſult *La Politique du Clerge de France*, A la Haye, 1682, p. 205. where there is a circumſtantial narrative of a negotiation with the Pope, for the purpoſe of taking off King Charles, as the readieſt means of re-eſtabliſhing popery. The misfortune is, that of any connexion the negotiators had with the immediate actors in that tragic affair, there is not the leaſt evidence.

* See Dr. Harris's *Hiſtory of Charles* II. vol. II. p. 376. Remark [GGGG].—The reality of the popiſh plot has been much queſtioned, chiefly upon the little credit due to Oates, Bedloe, and ſome other witneſſes, upon whoſe evidence ſeveral of the ſuppoſed conſpirators ſuffered death. And the argument againſt the reality of the plot ſtands thus. Oates, and Bedloe, and others were perjured in ſome inſtances, therefore the whole of their teſtimony was

King James II. was more of a bigot, and could neither reconcile himself nor his priests

falſe, therefore there was no popiſh plot. " But what occaſion have " we for Oates and Bedloe to prove this conſpiracy ? Let us, if you " pleaſe, lay theſe men out of the caſe, and judge of it only by " Colman's letters to father la Chaiſe and others. Theſe letters are " acknowledged to be genuine, nor are denied by Coleman himſelf. " There is one to the pope's nunico at Bruſſels, dated Auguſt 21, " 1674, which ſays in expreſs words, that the deſign proſpered ſo " well, that he doubted not but in a little time the buſineſs would " be managed to the utter ruin of the proteſtant party. Can any " thing be ſtronger than what *Coleman* ſays in one of his letters to " father *La Chaiſe ?* viz. *We have here a mighty work upon our " hands; no leſs than the converſion of three kingdoms, and by that " perhaps, the utter ſubduing of a peſtilent hereſy, which has " domineered over great part of this northern world a long time: " there were never ſuch hopes of ſucceſs ſince the death of Queen* " Mary, *as now in our days.* And towards the end of the letter " he vehemently ſolicits father La Chaiſe to obtain ſuccours of " money and arms for the execution of the grand deſign." I cite this from the French pamphlet above-mentioned [*La Politique du Clergé de France*, p. 118] for a particular reaſon to be given by and by : in the mean time, I muſt obſerve, that it is a miſtake in the Frenchman (who was Mr. Jurieu) that Coleman ſolicited for arms ; the only aid and aſſiſtance he wanted for the preſent, was that of money, which was to be applied to the neceſſities of the King, that he might not need ſupplies from a parliament ſo diſaffected to popery, but proceed immediately to diſſolve it. The reſt is perfectly agreeable to the authentic account in Coleman's trial. Soon after the publication of this pamphlet, it fell into the hands of the famous Mr. Arnauld (who then lay concealed in the low countries), " and " excited his indignation to that degree, that he laid aſide his con- " troverſy with father Malebranche, and determined, as much as in " him lay, to vindicate the honour of the church of France, againſt " the falſehood and artifices of the ſeditious writer of the *Politique*, " and to juſtify, as much poſſible, *the innocence of the catholics of* " *England.* For this purpoſe he publiſhed, in the year 1681, " *An Apology for the Catholics*, in two parts." *Nouvelles de Republique des lettres, Septembre* 1681, p. 110. In that part of his apology which related to the Engliſh catholics, he had thrown out ſome reflections on Sir Robert Southwell's evidence at Coleman's trial, which Sir Robert highly reſented ; and Arnauld hearing that

to the slow precarious methods of bringing in popery by political intrigue. His religion, he

that gentleman had complained of the injuſtice done him in the apology for the catholics, " immediately offered him ſuch ſatisfaction " as ſhould be judged convenient ; and after he [Arnauld] had " ſeen the proofs of Sir Robert Southwell's innocence, he wrote to " him in the moſt humble and ingenuous manner for the reparation " of his honour ; and to the end that the affair might become public " he deſired one of his friends to cauſe every thing that had paſſed " relating to this explanation to be printed. Mr. Arnauld was ob- " liged in this requeſt, and there was printed a ſecond addition to the " firſt part of the apology for the catholics, in which addition are " found the letters which Mr. Arnauld had written upon the ſub- " ject, and the anſwers of Sir Robert Southwell, together with the " pieces which juſtified the innocence of the latter." *Nouvelles de Republique des lettres*, May 1686, p. 504. The accuſation related to Sir Robert Southwell's evidence at Coleman's trial, as above-mentioned, which, no doubt, had been miſreported to Mr. Arnauld, and, on that account, laid him under the diſagreeable neceſſity of retracting his cenſure, and aſking pardon. As I have not ſeen Arnauld's apology for the Catholics, nor have been able to procure it, I cannot give any account of the particulars of Arnauld's charge, or of Sir Robert Southwell's defence; and I cannot help obſerving, that it is a little ſtrange ſo remarkable a fact ſhould have eſcaped the notice of all our hiſtorians who have written accounts of the popiſh plot. Sir Robert Southwell was clerk of the council, and was examined at Coleman's trial concerning the charge brought by Oates againſt Coleman before the king and council. Sir Robert there gave a clear ingenuous account, and confirmed that part of Oates's evidence relating to his knowledge of the treaſonable nature of Coleman's correſpondence with father La Chaiſe, before Coleman's papers were examined. This was giving Oates credit in a very material point, and went a great way towards verifying that part of his evidence againſt the Jeſuits, relating to the papers and letters he had ſeen, which were not forth coming. It was not ſufficient, in this caſe for the papiſts to diſcredit Oates's teſtimony, unleſs they could ſet aſide that of Sir Robert Southwell too ; and this conſideration will effectually account for the falſe intelligence Arnauld had received concerning Sir Robert's evidence at Coleman's trial. Mr. Bayle ſays, " that this retractation, when Mr. Arnauld's hiſtory ſhould be " written, would not make the leaſt glorious part of it." But as Arnauld was not always ſo ingenuous in his controverſies, one might perhaps account for his candor on this occaſion upon a different mo-

thought, obliged him, and his sovereign power, he imagined, authorized him, to establish

tive than that of a desire of doing justice to Protestants. The Jesuits and their agents and dependents were chiefly accused of forming and carrying on the conspiracy against Charles II. How little Mr. Arnauld was concerned for *their* honour, all the world knows; and possibly enough, might not be displeased with having this opportunity of exposing to the public what lengths of falsehood and misrepresentation they would go, when the honour of so zealous a disciple as Coleman was at stake. From these efforts of the papists to calumniate Sir Robert Southwell in this instance, we may perceive how diligent they were to remove every circumstance out of sight which might fix upon them the odium of so foul a conspiracy. But all in vain. Allow Oates and Bedloe to be perjured in some instances, their evidence is confirmed in others by such notorious facts and circumstances, and by the joint testimony of persons of so respectable characters, that no reasonable doubt can remain but that they were conscious with the persons they accused of a detestable conspiracy to subvert the religion and liberties of Great Britain. At the same time we have Coleman's papers, which shew how few scruples they had concerning the means. His letters to father La Chaise discovered the rancor of his heart towards the Northern *heresy*. He plumes himself upon the hopes of seeing the utter ruin of the protestant party, and a return of the glorious days of Queen Mary. And yet, when he comes to draw a declaration for the King, wherein reasons were to be given for the dissolution of the parliament, he could talk of *the beauty and splendor of the true protestant church of England*, and make his Majesty speak in a style of the greatest affection for it, with expressions of a suitable aversion to popery. But all this was for the service of the catholic cause, and a case for which a dispensation might easily be had. In the mean while, these counterpaces of Coleman have an unlucky aspect upon the asseverations of the Jesuits at their execution, and the oaths of the scholars of St. Omers; "from whence," says a foreign writer, "a number of libels have issued against Oates and Bedloe, "and we on this side the water are to be persuaded that this whole "business depends entirely on the testimony of two flagitious rascals." *Les derniers efforts de l'innocence affligée*, p. 102.— How exactly does this tally with the false intelligence conveyed to Mr. Arnauld? and, no doubt, if the same occasions had fallen out in other cases, more of these calumnies would have been detected. These pieces of foreign history of a domestic transaction, the papists

his own faith by the most open and undisguised acts of power. In these attempts he was impolitic enough to let the nation see, that popery was always the same; a cruel, intolerant, but at the same time a treacherous and hypocritical system, which, to compass its ends, could put on the mask of unlimited toleration on some occasions, even while on others it was breaking through every sacred fence of law and justice, to plant its votaries where their influence was most likely to undermine the principal supports of the protestant religion. It is no wonder that these insults upon the constitution should provoke a general desertion of all his subjects, who valued the blessings of religious and civil liberty as they deserved. The consequence was, a general invitation to the prince of Orange to undertake our deliverance, and the expulsion of the bigoted violator of the laws and liberties of a free and brave people.

It may well be supposed, that this was an event the papists could not brook with any

are now bringing home, to discredit, if they can, the authentic records of their own country. At this very time they are sneering the popish plot, in their factious publications, as the mere fiction of Oates and Bedloe, just as their worthy predecessors of St. Omers did in their day. Even now, while I am writing this, the *London Chronicle of July* 21 is brought me, wherein is an extract from Voltaire's Commentary on Beccaria's Essay on Crimes and Punishments, exhibiting a most false and invidious account of Oates's evidence against Coleman, and taking it for granted that there were no other witnesses to prove the popish plot upon the Jesuits but Oates and Bedloe. But their misery is, that, as they cannot support their superstition till they can destroy the faith of the bible, so neither can they vindicate their social or political principles, till they can destroy the faith of all civil history.

patience. Accordingly they immediately fell to work to bring back first their abdicated prince, and after his demise, his popish representatives, and all with a view of finishing the hopeful work which was interrupted, so happily for us, at the revolution.*

* The various plots to aſſaſſinate King William, which are of too recent date to be denied, and other attempts of a leſs criminal appearance indeed, but ſtill undertaken with the avowed purpoſe of ſubverting the proteſtant government, have been repreſented as the mere effect of a political ſtruggle for power, or, at worſt, of principles common to proteſtants with the papiſts. But this I deny. To talk of the religion of ſome of the profligates who engaged in theſe *laudable* ſervices, would be a mere jeſt; and as for thoſe who adhered to the nonjuring clergy, they were indeed no other than a ſect of popery, who ſtopped ſhort at a few idolatrous circumſtances in the popiſh worſhip, juſt as our proteſtant diſſenters do at ſome ceremonies in the church of England. This appears from the principles of Leſley and many others who have written in defence of that ſyſtem. See *Biſhop Burnet's Introduction to the third volume of his Hiſtory of the Reformation*, p. xxii. King James II. himſelf, it ſeems, bigot as he was, had ſome ſcruples concerning the lawfulneſs of that murderous project, of which one Jones was to have been the wicked inſtrument in 1690, but was at length *ſatisfied both in* CONSCIENCE *and* HONOUR. *Burnet, Hiſt. O. T. vol. II. p.* 56. And upon the very ſame principles which ſatisfied the popiſh bigot, were Friend and Perkins abſolved by three of the catholic nonjuring clergy, in the year 1696, at the place of execution, though the criminals *expreſſed no ſort of repentance for the ill deſigns they had been engaged in, and which they owned, ibid. p.* 174. The healing circumſtance was, that King William's hereſy, and the dignity of the catholic church, were equally objects to both parties. In the ſame manner muſt be accounted for all the plots in Queen Anne's reign: that of Sir John Maclean in 1704. Hooke's negotiations, and Fourbin's expedition to Scotland in 1708. The intrigues of the jacobites and papiſts during the four laſt years of her reign. The rebellion in 1715. The conſpiracy of Count Gyllenburgh and Baron Goertz: that of Atterbury and Layer. The rebellion in 1745, in which were engaged ſome of the ſame perſons who had appeared in arms for the old Pretender thirty years before. So that from the acceſſion of Queen Elizabeth, to the laſt hour of George the II. we have a chain of facts, by which it appears that the Pretender's motto,

From this period the papists have had an additional cause of enmity to the British go-

ſequi, ſinemque tueri, has ever been the *mot de guerre* of the whole popiſh party who have had any intereſt in, or any connexion with this kingdom from the time of the reformation, even under all their diſappointments. We are now, however, to believe that under the preſent reign they are the moſt dutiful of all the denominations of Britiſh ſubjects, and particularly that they take the principles of political obedience from their religion. This we learn from Meſſieurs Brook and the author of the *Conſiderations on the Penal Laws*, &c. And to make this a clear caſe, father Philips, in an Appendix to his hiſtory of Cardinal Pole, juſt publiſhed, has undertaken to give us a detail of thoſe principles from the ſcriptures; but, like an experienced veteran, artfully keeps to generals, without once touching the true point in which we want ſatisfaction. For who ever denied, that the ſcriptures enjoined ſubmiſſion and obedience to the ſupreme legiſlative powers? Or who ever imagined, that the papiſts were not diſpoſed to pay a dutiful ſubmiſſion to thoſe whom they eſteem the ſupreme powers, whether in conſequence of the ſcripture injunctions or not? If a Jeſuit were to be aſked, why he is diſpoſed to obey the general of his order, preferably to any other power, he would doubtleſs alledge theſe ſcriptures, having previouſly informed you that the government of his ſociety is the *legal* government to which he is bound to ſubmit. Now Mr. Philips himſelf hath limited his ſcriptural obedience *to legal* government; but whether he eſteems the preſent government of Great Britain a *legal* government, he ſaith not. If therefore he ſhould be of opinion, that *ſome foreign prince, perſon, prelate, ſtate, or potentate, hath, and ought to have, juriſdiction, power, ſuperiority, pre-eminence or authority eccleſiaſtical or ſpiritual within this realm*, it is certain that ſo far as ſuch *juriſdiction*, &c. is excluded, by the laws of this realm, the government of this realm muſt, in the eſtimation of Mr. Philips, be illegal. And if the foreign power, to which he aſſigns ſuch juriſdiction, ſhould happen to be that of the biſhop of Rome, all the texts of ſcripture he hath cited, and all his reaſoning upon them, ſuch as it is, muſt be ultimately referred by him to the Pope, ſo that King George ſhall no longer be intitled to Mr. Philips's obedience than the Pope chuſes he ſhould. If Mr. Philips ſhould ſay, that the Pope's having juriſdiction in matters eccleſiaſtical or ſpiritual, leaves the ſupreme civil power ſtill entire in the hands of the king and parliament of Great Britain, we ſhall deſire to know, whether, in Mr. Philips's opinion, the Pope may not, in every place where he hath ſpiritual juriſdiction, exerciſe civil juriſdiction likewiſe, *in ordine ad ſpiritu-*

vernment. Before the revolution they were enemies to the protestant sovereigns of Great

alia? If yea, I desire to know what Mr. Philips's civil obedience to King George III is worth above three farthings, whenever the interests of the church of Rome come in question? If he thinks the Pope hath not civil jurisdiction, &c. within this realm *in any case*, we desire to know how he will acquit Cardinal Pole of high treason in acting under his legantine powers, before the statute restoring the Pope's authority was passed? Surely Mr. Philips will be under no difficulty to explain himself upon matters so plain and obvious. In the mean time, he will easily find credit with us, that *what he hath advanced will be disowned by very few or none of those who profess the same religion*, because every word of it might have been owned by Garnet, at the very moment he was absolving the gun-powder conspirators. Mr. Philips is exceedingly provoked at somebody who "charges him with taking an infamous pleasure in aspersing and "blackening the manners of the reformers by false representations." Appendix, p. 29. Hath he replied to this charge? Hath he acquitted himself of it? Not in the least. It is fixed upon him by his accuser, and is immoveable and indelible. And though he so highly resents the imputation, he is so far from being ashamed of the practice, that he is at the same dirty work again in this very Appendix, p. 15. where, upon the credit of one Mr. Nicholas Faunt, "a voucher above exception, and one of the conspicuous characters "of that and the following reign," we are told, "that Queen Eliza- "beth's court, was a *scene of all enormities, where wickedness* "*reigned in the highest degree*;" "a memorable contrast," says Mr. "Philips, of the regularity of Queen Mary's." A strong argument, no doubt, against the reformation! Will Mr. Philips allow us to try the force of it in Scotland, in the court of another Queen Mary? But what? *All* enormities in the court of Queen Elizabeth, and none in that of Queen Mary? Yes, one, which was not in Elizabeth's court, and a more flagitious enormity, by ten degrees, than ever was in it. I mean a spirit of inhuman bigotry and sour superstition, diabolically delighted in sacrificing unhappy innocents to the idols of Rome Papal, the parent and nurse of more abominations than Rome Pagan. Much good may it do Mr. Philips with such regularity. But can he wonder that they who did not admire it so much as he may do, should be a little joyous (licentiously joyous if he pleases), that this female bigot was taken away from the court, and that access was now opened to a princess of a different disposition, and before whom the countenances of the Gardiners and the Bonners were no longer seen? The court of Charles II was the

Britain, only because they *were* protestants. The line of succession came not into the ques-

court of a popiſh king, and was, at leaſt, as fruitful in enormities and wickedneſs as the court of Elizabeth. When the corruptions of that court were objected to, the excuſe was, that "no wonder the odium "of the hypocritical formalities of the preceding times ſhould tranſ-"port people to the contrary extreme; an excuſe which was juſt as good in the mouths of Queen Elizabeth's courtiers as in the mouths of King Charles's. What would Mr. Philips think of an hiſtorian who ſhould ſay, that "the licentiouſneſs of King Charles's court was a memorable contraſt to the regularity "of Oliver Cromwell's," by way of inſinuating that independency is a religion of more regularity than popery? After all, Mr. Philips is not out of his road in making theſe obſervations. It is his view to gain proſelytes, and nothing more taking with the herd than theſe inſinuations. It is a kind of hiſtorical legerdemain, which excites admiration, at the ſame time that it deceives the eye. This indeed, as far as I have ſeen, is Mr. Philips's fort. He ſhould never ſtir out of it. He hath begun his Appendix, for example, with a *Diſſertation on the authority of the Latin Edition of the Scripture, called the Vulgate*, wherein he propoſes to aſcertain *the ſenſe in which the council of Trent has declared the latin Vulgate Edition of the Scripture to be authentic*. Here he hath ſtept into the province of the caſuiſtical critic; with how little ſucceſs, may be ſeen in the Monthly Record of Literature for September, and in the Monthly Review for October, 1767. The deſign of theſe profeſſions of ſubmiſſion to a proteſtant government, on principles ſo ſeemingly different from thoſe entertained by papiſts heretofore, is without doubt to perſuade us that we may be perfectly aſſured, they are not now engaged in any machinations to diſturb our government; a circumſtance which may poſſibly be better known to thoſe, to whoſe lot it may fall to write the hiſtory of the preſent times twenty years hence, than it is to us at this day. If they have no views but of peace and quietneſs, and ſubmiſſion to the powers that be, whence comes their extraordinary aſſiduity at this particular period in making converts? Whence their petulant ſcoffs, their inſults, and even their menaces, to thoſe who oppoſe their progreſs in this work? Have the papiſts of this day more zeal for the ſouls of men than they who lived ten or twenty years ago? This we ſhould be more ready to believe, if we made no obſervations on the manners and converſation of thoſe they employ in this buſineſs, or on the means they make uſe of for the purpoſe. Some of the leſs prudent among them have made their boaſt (as is obſerved above) that they were ſure of the indulgence of the government, notwithſtanding any complaints that might be made of their audacious contempt of the laws enacted to ſuppreſs the practice of proſelyting. Have they, in re-

tion. It was sufficient for the justification of their discontents and conspiracies, that the

turn, given the government any of those pledges of their allegiance which their forefathers refused to give? Have they given any evidence that they have changed their principles on this head, on which it is fit for the guardians of the protestant settlement of the crown to rely? Must not every proselyte they make espouse the same principles? Every man of common sense, who is in the least acquainted with the principles of popery, can give himself satisfactory answers to these questions. Upon what grounds then can the papists pretend to this indulgence? Can they expect it from the guardians of the protestant religion in Great Britain, while they abide by these principles? If not, wherein have they shewn that the alteration of their principles hath intitled them to this indulgence? I have observed in some of the papers published on behalf of the papists, an argument drawn from the permission given some time ago for the residence of a popish bishop in Canada, in favour of the supposition, that the government have not the apprehensions of the bad effects of the popish principles of the present times, which are entertained by some of their over-zealous adversaries. Into the true reasons for this permission I presume not to inquire. But if the reasons given for it in some of our public prints may be depended upon, namely, that it was granted "in consideration of the French court's engaging "not to abet or assist in any shape the son of the Pretender" [see the *London Chronicle of August* 2, 1766], there could hardly be a stronger instance of the distrust the government had at that time of the principles and dispositions of our domestic papists. There is not a man of sense in the kingdom, who would not express his contempt for all the efforts France could make in favour of the Pretender, if the whole people of Great Britain were unanimous in their affections for our most gracious sovereign upon the throne, and equally and cordially zealous for the support of his government; and this indeed we have reason to hope is the case with all British protestants. It is in the highest degree probable, that, without the encouragement the French have had from time to time from the popish party in our own country, they would never have concerned themselves (whatever they might occasionally profess), actually to attempt any thing in favour of the Pretender. But the experience we have had of the temper and principles of the popish adherents of the Pretender, and whither they have always been looking for assistance, is surely sufficient to put us upon our guard against any future mischief that might arise from such dispositions; and was doubtless the motive which prevailed at that period to have that door shut against popish influence, by a measure which otherwise perhaps might not have appeared quite unexceptionable. Of that I pretend not to judge. But

government was in the hands of an heretic, without enquiring into his title by descent, wherein perhaps, had there been any defect, the faith of a Roman catholic prince might have made it whole.

But now that they who pretend a claim to the crown of these realms, as the lineal successors of the house of Stuart, are bred in the Roman catholic religion, and are superseded likewise by the settlement of the crown in a protestant family, the illustrious princes of the house of Hanover; the kings of Great Britain become obnoxious to the papists, not only as reputed heretics, but as breaking in upon the hereditary right of their favourite family, as hath sufficiently appeared by the several manifestoes which were published by the late pretender and his son, to justify the two last rebellions.*

whatever the case of a distant colony, in the circumstances that Canada was before our conquest of it, might be, no precedent can be drawn from it in favour of any such measure at home; and arguments of this kind only serve to shew the encroaching nature of popish pretensions, and to raise very reasonable suspicions that they would extend them in the present case much farther than merely to the free exercise of their religion. It is said, the Roman catholics in Canada have seminaries allowed, as well as a bishop. The former indeed seems to be necessarily implied in the permission to have the latter. The destructive tendency of such permission at home, to the very being of our constitution, need not be told. The public hath already been apprized of it from other hands [See the Appendix, No. III]. Though I do not believe that the French can either impose the Pretender, or their religion upon us, without the aid of the popish party at home; yet I would not undertake to say what that party might not be able to do without the French, were they allowed to have their seminaries, and to exercise the discipline usually practised in them. with the same freedom in this kingdom, as they enjoy them in popish countries.

* The papists, on both these occasions, were very solicitous to make the protestants believe, that no alteration of the established re-

The penal laws against the papists, in this view, appear to be no more than necessary to secure the protestant settlement of the crown of Great Britain, and, by consequence, the rights and liberties of British subjects, against the effects of principles so destructive of our happy constitution. And it is to little purpose to complain of their severity, when we have so often experienced that even that severity hath not been sufficient to discourage the attempts of the popish party, whenever they had a prospect of succeeding in bringing about the ruin of our religion and liberties; and when we consider that, in all human probability, nothing but this very severity of the penal laws has prevented them from succeeding. To tolerate men with such principles, and with no

ligion was intended. With respect to the rebellion in 1715, the following anecdote from an unexceptionable witness affords the fullest proof to the contrary. "He (the Pretender) was so afraid of admitting any words (into his declaration) which might be construed "into a promise of his consenting to those things, which should be "found necessary for the present or future security of our constitution, that in a paragraph where he was made made to say, that he "thought himself obliged to be solicitous for the prosperity of the "church of England, the word prosperity was expunged; and we "left, by this mental reservation, to guess what he was solicitous "for. It could not be for her prosperity: that he had expunged: "it must therefore be for her destruction, which, in his language, "would have been stiled her conversion." *Bolingbroke's Letter to Sir W. Windham*, p. 284, where more may be seen to the same purpose. His declaration in 1745 was in terms equally equivocal. "By his promising (says a sensible Remarker on this latter declaration) to maintain his protestant subjects in the free exercise of "their religion conformable to the laws of the land, must be understood, not the laws since the usurpation, but those of his father, "who sent a popish army to root out the presbyterians (of Scotland) "with the most rigorous prosecution." *Henderson's Hist. Rebellion* 1745, p. 24. See likewise the excellent remarks of the *Occasional Writer*, on this declaration.

more restraint than is laid upon protestant dissenters (whose principles and affections are well known to be friendly to the civil and religious rights of mankind in general, and to our own government in particular,) would be to nourish in our bosom a nest of vipers, prepared to subvert our constitution whenever an opportunity should offer, which they could hardly want a year to an end, were they to obtain the full toleration for which they are pleading.

But it is said, if you exclude them from toleration merely on account of their political doctrines, why do you molest them in their religious worship, shut up their mass-houses, and prosecute their priests, who are merely ecclesiastical officers?

To this I answer: 1. Whenever the papists will openly and candidly disavow those political principles which render them obnoxious to our civil government, we shall then be able to distinguish between those principles and their religious opinions. In the present state of popery, both sorts of doctrine are so intimately incorporated with each other, as not to admit of any separation, till they shall think fit to make it themselves. In the mean time, every papist is of course an enemy to the British constitution, and the guardians of that constitution have no way of knowing who is or is not a papist, but by his practising popish rites and devotions.

2. The priests of that communion are known, by the authentic forms which invest them with their function, to be more especially bound to an implicit obedience to a foreign and inimical

jurisdiction, with an express exclusion of all subjection to an heretical government. A popish priest is accordingly known to be an enemy to our government, by the same tokens that discover him to be a priest. And hence it is that his saying or singing mass brings him within the reach of the penal laws, without farther evidence. But,

3. Except in this single instance, no papist is convicted upon this presumptive evidence. A lay-papist, even though arms should be found in his house, is not amenable to the penal laws, till he becomes a *recusant convict.* And here the trial is totally of a civil nature, namely, by tendering him the oaths of allegiance and supremacy; which if he refuses, neither the law of nature or of nations will allow that he should be continued in the protection of that government from which he withholds this equitable security, and that with a view of being more at liberty to overturn it.

These considerations naturally suggest to us of the clergy, what is our own duty in respect to our vigilance over those who are more immediately under our inspection in a religious light. Principles of rebellion are not, we are certain, the principles of christianity; and every thing of that sort which is taught under the name of religion, must have the worst effects upon the dispositions and manners of those who learn and espouse them, as they implant in their minds a persuasion that they are doing God service by such practices, as they might see, if they were permitted to consult the word of God, are abomination to him.

It is therefore our duty to lay before our people the pernicious consequences of popish doctrines, both on account of their present mischief in human society, and their tendency to defeat the future hopes of every individual who is corrupted by them. Every convert to popery is a double loss. He is lost, in the first place, to the glorious liberty of the sons of God, and becomes a slave to a base and sordid superstition, which exercises an imperious tyranny over his conscience, and fetters him once more in that bondage and darkness, from which the light of the gospel was intended to set him free. He is lost, in the next place, as an affectionate and obedient subject to a most gracious King, and a most eligible constitution of government; and inlists himself in a pernicious confederacy to subvert the rights and liberties which depend upon them.

These endeavours of the clergy, however, must be understood to be required chiefly within our own province, which directs us to no other means of instruction but the force of reason, and the evidence of scripture. I need hardly mention, that the means of suppressing popery in the hands of the civil magistrate, and of a christian clergy respectively, are very different. Popery, as we have seen, is convicted by a set of destructive principles, and a thousand overt-acts justified by them, of aiming at the subversion of every thing that supports the freedom and privileges of British protestants, and in these circumstances precludes itself from every reasonable pretension to toleration, either in a civil or a religious sense. The laws have therefore most wisely

impowered the civil magistrate to stop its progress in every attempt to extend its influence upon any pretence whatsoever.

But the weapons of a christian and a protestant clergy are not carnal. To guard the civil liberties of mankind from the conspiracies of a desperate faction, and to watch over the people, that they be not corrupted in their religious principles, belong to two different departments. The latter is peculiar to our profession, and our rule and direction for discharging it are in the holy scriptures alone.

The clergy indeed, as dutiful fellow-subjects with their flocks, are bound to co-operate with the ministers of God for their good, in *every* province. But their proper business is to labour in the word and doctrine; and the whole force of the charge upon them, which I have mentioned above, turns upon the supposition that if they had done their duty faithfully in their own department, and had been diligent and frequent in laying before the people those proofs and evidences from holy writ, which shew in the clearest manner the various impostures of popery, and the great spiritual danger of being deluded by them, it would not have been in the power of those wicked emissaries, who compass sea and land to make proselytes to the pope, to pervert the people from their civil allegiance, or to engage them in any evil design to bereave them of those inestimable rights and privileges to which they are intitled, both as the disciples of Christ, and the free subjects of the crown of Great Britain.

It has been asserted, and upon no weak presumption, that if there should be a man of

common sense so circumstanced as to have no other way of coming at a complete view of the design and tendency of the gospel of Christ, he might have it very sufficiently, by putting down a list of doctrines the reverse of those taught in the church of Rome, and particularly those upon which she builds her exclusive authority. And indeed no great wonder. For a religion where idolatry is practised and encouraged in so many gross instances, and whose aim and end is to establish an arbitrary dominion over the human mind, for so many lucrative and sensual purposes, could but maintain its reputation for a very little while, without those slavish traditions of the pharisaical kind, and the superstitious pageantry of paganism, which our blessed Saviour condemned, and came on earth to abolish.*

* Perhaps there is not any more effectual way of securing our people from the snares laid for them by popish priests and other emissaries employed by them, than to point out to them the severe denunciations of the wrath of God against idolatry under all its forms and disguises, with which the scriptures both of the old and new testament abound, and to confront them with the worship of the papists exhibited in their books of devotion. The simplest man alive, who has common sense, and reads these passages in his bible, can hardly be imposed upon by the most artificial glosses the advocates forpopery can put upon so evident a contempt of the word of God. There have been, and there possibly may be still, members of the church of England, who have been backward to impute idolatry to the church of Rome, from what apparent motives I forbear to mention. "But, saith Bishop Stilingfleet, I cannot see why the authority of "some very few persons, though of great learning, should bear "sway against the constant opinion of our church ever since the re-"formation." This learned bishop hath indeed himself fallen under the reprehension of an eminent prelate of the present times, for endeavouring to fix idolatry upon the church of Rome by an incompetent argument, "The advocates of the church of Rome," says this learned writer, "to evade the charge of idolatry, with which

It is true, we have one disadvantage in our circumstances, which cannot be mentioned without regret; and that is, that our common people in general have not only a very slender acquaintance with the scriptures, but likewise seem in no great degree desirous to improve their little stock of knowledge of this kind, or to be sensible how much they may suffer for the want of it. Their ignorance accordingly, as may well be expected, makes them slow in apprehending arguments drawn from the word

" they are urged by the reformed, pretend that this crime conſiſts " in giving the worſhip due to the ſupreme God to inferior beings. " The excellent Biſhop Stillingfleet, in oppoſing this ſubterfuge, " attempted to prove that the moſt civilized pagans, who are con- " feſſed to be idolaters, did not give the honours due to the firſt " cauſe to their inferior Gods; the firſt cauſe, as he pretends, " being worſhiped by them as ſuch. An aſſertion, which, if " true would confute all that the Prophets and the Apoſtles ſay con- " cerning the ſtate and condition of the pagan world." *Doctrine of Grace*, p. 248. ed. 2d. The learned Prelate calls this pretence of the papiſts a ſubterfuge, from whence it is reaſonable to conclude, that, in his opinion, the papiſts are nevertheleſs guilty of idolatry, though Biſhop Stillingfleet's argument ſhould go upon a falſe fact. But if we take the word of the papiſts, who ſhould know their own intentions the beſt, that they never give ſupreme honour to inferior beings, I do not ſee how this learned prelate would, upon his own ſtate of the caſe, convict them of idolatry. For if in all that the Prophets and Apoſtles have ſaid concerning the ſtate and condition of the pagan world, no inſtance can be brought where the civilized pagans worſhiped their inferior Gods with honours inferior to thoſe with which they worſhiped the firſt cauſe, that ſpecies of worſhip will not be to be found in the whole bible, and conſequently cannot there be condemned as idolatry. Surely this is a caſe which well deſerves to be cleared up more at length. When the ſame learned hand found fault with Dr. Middleton for deriving the ſuperſtitions of popery from thoſe of paganiſm, the Doctor was ſtill living to vindicate his hypotheſis; and accordingly ſet all right in a ſmall compaſs. In the preſent caſe, Dr. Stillingfleet is long ſince dead and gone, and few have ſurvived him who have had the ſame extenſive

of God, and much in the dark with respect to controverted points, the decision of which depends upon that kind of proof, when such matters come in their way. Hence they are liable to be deceived by those who, observing their natural turn and disposition, are ready to humour them in their own way.

There is nothing that popish converters dislike so much in the course of their occupation, as to meet with an enlightened mind. Their common cant is there, of no service to them, and they are driven into distresses for which they are not prepared. Whereas ignorance gives them all the advantages they can desire. Ignorance is weak, credulous, and superstitious; easily terrified with such phantoms and bugbears as romish craftsmen well know how to raise, and easily allured likewise with hopes and promises of present and future good things, which the inventions of men have stored up in the fantastic treasury of the church of Rome. And when these artifices and delusions meet with the secular spirit of one, who desires to indulge with the good things of this life, without losing his hopes of happiness in the next, he readily gives up his privilege of examining spiritual things for himself, and will think himself obliged to an officious priest who will

reach in sacred and prophane learning. It would be hard upon his memory, if his learned labours upon this subject might be overthrown by a bare counter-assertion without particular proof. His argument is certainly friendly to the protestant cause, and it would be equally hard to deprive us of the benefit of it, merely out of deference to an admired name. I therefore cannot but hope that this learned and ingenious prelate will speedily make good his proposition by a particular demonstration, that we may know what we have to trust to.

undertake to secure his salvation for him, without more trouble on his own part than that of going through a few superstitious forms on solemn occasions, which the most immoral man upon earth may practice with as much ease, and as good effect, as the most pious and sincere christian.

But from the beginning of the reformation it was not so. The common people of that time were not so to be ensnared. The scriptures had for a long time been locked up from them in an unknown tongue; and when, by the care of their reformed pastors, the bible was translated into english, it is almost incredible with what avidity the poor people applied themselves to the reading of it. Readers indeed in those days were but scarce; and happy was the company who could meet with a person with an audible voice, and a distinct pronunciation, that would read the scriptures to them. Our histories give us accounts of the vast crowds of people who attended such meetings in Paul's church, and other places, where english bibles were provided for that purpose.*

* See *Strype's Memorials of Archbiſhop Cranmer*, p. 64 *ſub. anno* 1538. *Heylin's Hiſt. of the Reformation.* p. 9 and 20, and *Fuller's Church Hiſtory*, *book* vii. p. 387; who tells us, that "few country pariſhes could go to the coſt of this bible of the greater "volume [printed by Grafton, 1541]; but that Biſhop Bonner "cauſed ſix of them to be chained in the church of St. Paul, in "convenient places." See likewiſe Burnet, *Reform*, *Vol. II.* p. 249. and concerning the prohibition of Tindal's Tranſlation, ſee Burnet, *Reform. Vol. III.* p. 5. The ſtory both of this prohibition, and of the allowance of the other editions, is told by all theſe hiſtorians (Strype excepted) with little accuracy, and not without ſome confuſion; which is the more remarkable, as Fox (who was

This happened in the reigns of K. Henry VIII and K. Edward VI.; and what proficiency the people made in christian knowledge, by this application and attention to the word of God, appears by the readiness, good sense, and solidity, with which even some of the poorer sort answered the popish doctors, who were appointed to question them on the subject of what was called their heresy, in the barbarous reign of Queen Mary.

Nothing can be more desirable than that the common people may once more return to the same disposition, and arm themselves with the word of God against deceivers of all sorts. One may safely venture to say that their victories over the crafty sophisters of the church of Rome would be easy and cheap. They might then be left, with great security, to their own judgment, which will always then be the best informed, when men examine the evidences of truth and falsehood, by the diligent and sincere application of their own capacities and endeavours.

I have always considered the duty of protestant teachers to consist chiefly in endeavouring to raise and revive this spirit of studying the scriptures in our respective flocks; but more particularly in opposition to the methods of stifling the truth, and discouraging free and

prior to them all) hath given a most circumstantial account of this whole matter in his *Martyrology*, *Vol. II.* p. 1086, 1087. Fox says, that Bonner promised Grafton the Printer at Paris, that he would set up six of his bibles in St. Paul's; but that he performed his promise, Fox saith not. Though, considering that Bonner was a retainer to Cromwell, the patron of Grafton's bible, it is not improbable but he might.

impartial inquiries into it, which give the popish clergy so many advantages over both their own people, and those they attempt to seduce. As we pretend to no authority to be believed upon our own word in matters of salvation, or to be governed by any precedents but those in the holy scriptures, it is for our credit and reputation, while we ourselves are honest and upright, that our hearers should be competent judges of what we deliver to them, which it is impossible they should be if they have little or no skill in the rule by which their judgments should be formed.

What I am here observing is more particularly true with respect to popery. The errors of the church of Rome are not such only as arise from the controverted sense of particular passages of scripture, which is the case among those disagreeing sects to whom the scripture is the common measure of judgment. The insufficiency of scripture to furnish saving knowledge, and to decide controversies, is a fundamental doctrine of the church of Rome; nor are the propagators of popery ever willingly brought to put their cause upon that test. But as the protestants had early opened these fountains of instruction by free translations of them into the vulgar tongues of their respective countries, it became necessary for the papists, in many cases, to obviate their objections by appeals to the same authority, and even (to prevent untoward suspicions in their own people) to give them a freer access to them, than before the reformation they had allowed. This however they did not venture to do, till they had forewarned them, in some instances, of

the little estimation due to the scriptures, and had, in others, corrupted and falsified them by such additions, omissions, and mis-translations, as might give them the air of countenancing their own superstition.*

We object therefore to popery, not as it is an erroneous sect of christianity, but as it is an anti-christian system of superstition totally subversive of the truth as well as of the benefits of the gospel of Christ; attempting to transfer our faith and hopes of everlasting life from Christ the rock of our salvation, to the sandy foundation of human authority, and precarious tradition. For as to what they tell us of their church deriving its authority from Christ, and their pastors from the Apostles in an uninter-

* For the groſſeſt inſtances of the contempt of the ſcriptures in the roman church, as well as among their private doctors, ſee a pamphlet, intituled *Popery an Enemy to Scripture, by James Serces, vicar of Appleby. in Lincolnſhire*, p. 42, 43, &c. And for inſtances of foul corruption and falſification of the ſcriptures, ſee the ſame book, from p. 49 to p. 99. *Cartwright's and Fulk's Confutation of the Rhemiſt's Tranſlation, Gloſſes, and Annotations on the New Teſtament*, abounds with examples of the ſame ſort. Nor are inſtances wanting even in our own time and country. I have now before me an Engliſh Teſtament of the Rhemiſh Tranſlation, printed 1749, in twelves, with ſhort notes, ſome of which are abridged from the Rhemiſh annotators, and others added by a more modern hand; and likewiſe with conſiderable alterations in the text: as, Matth. xi. 21. where the old Rhemiſts have it, *would have done penance in heare-cloth* [hair-cloth], the modern reviſer has given it, *done penance in ſack-cloth.* For though the poor ignorant engliſh catholics, for whoſe uſe this tranſlation is calculated, might be taught to believe that the humiliation of the jews here alluded to, was like the penances in the roman church, yet that the jews wore hair cloth on thoſe occaſions would not be quite ſo eaſily believed; not to mention, that ſhould this tranſlation by any untoward accident fall into the hands of heretics, ſuch an impoſition might have made the papiſts perfectly ridiculous. Thus far mere ſhame hath compelled them to do partial juſtice at leaſt to the ſacred text

rupted succession, we have a surer way of judging these their pretensions, than by a chain of traditionary legends; namely, the direction of Christ himself to examine the merit of all such pretenders by their *fruits;* and by these it will appear that, instead of being the legitimate pastors of the christian flock, they are rather the offspring of those *wolves in sheep's cloathing*, of whom our blessed Lord gave his disciples so many cautions to beware.

even while they are corrupting it. For it is certain that these public humiliations among the jews were no more like the penances in the roman church, than an entire covering of sack-cloth is like a hair-shirt. But in other instances our revisor is more trusty to his cause. For whereas our Saviour says, *Matth*, xv. 9, according to our translation, *In vain do they worship me teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*, lest this should be thought to bear hard upon the traditions of popery, the revisor hath thought proper to explain it away in the following note, abridged from the Rhemish translators. "As to the rules and ordinances of holy church, "touching fasts, festivals, &c. these are no ways repugnant to, "but highly agreeable to God's holy word, and all christian piety. "Neither are they to be counted amongst the doctrines and "commandments of men, because they proceed not from mere "human authority, but from that which Christ hath established in "his church; whose pastors he has commanded us to hear and obey, "even as himself. St. *Luke*, x. 16. St. *Matt.* xviii. 17." The *et cætera* above marked is a pregnant one, big with all the traditional doctrines of popery, and renders this determination of our Saviour of none effect, just as the pharisaical traditions defeated the commandments of God. "We demand of you," says Cartwright in his censure of this note, "whether it is your doctrine, that, al- "though the parents should die in the street, yet may not their mon- "kish daughters make a step out of their nunnery to save their lives? "We suppose yourselves mutter some such thing upon Matth. viii. "22." They do indeed more than mutter it; for these are their words: "By this we see, that not only no worldly or carnal re- "spect, but *no other laudable duty towards our parents*, ought "to stay us from following Christ, *and choosing a life of greater* "*perfection*." But every one knows, that, in the language of popery, *a life of perfection* means the life of a monk or a nun.

To obviate these base misrepresentations, it will become us to assert the honour and importance of our christian scriptures, to labour earnestly with our people to have continual recourse to them, as the original records of whatever concerns our common salvation; to encourage them in the study of them, by pointing out the simplicity in which indispensable matters of faith are delivered in them, and the plainness and perspicuity of those precepts which concern our practical duty; to warn them of the woe denounced upon those who add to or take from them, and the danger of following blind guides, and hypocritical pretenders to authority, under commissions of which the scriptures make no mention but to condemn them; and which, as those very scriptures warn us, are calculated for nothing but to promote imposture, to captivate the minds of those to whom Christ has given liberty from all spiritual dominion but his own, and to gratify the insatiable avarice and ambition of insolent, sordid, and self-interested men.*

* Among the many objections to popery, there is none more striking to reasonable ingenuous minds, than the *meanness* which runs through all its peculiar doctrines and superstitions. One can hardly open any of their rituals without being put in mind of St. Paul's *beggarly elements*, *Gal.* iv. 9. which all the pomp and parade of their ceremonies cannot disguise; and, as a certain judicious writer of our own country observes, "the rabble do usually cast their eyes upon, "as children do on the Lord Mayor's pageants; admiring the splen-"dor of those that ride in them, who, considered in their own na-"ture, are but mean men's issue, and thus adorned at the city cost. "Yet their external varnish doth so obstruct the organs of sense, as "they do not perceive the poorness of the people that bear them "up." For who knows not that the magnificent implements, utensils, and ornaments, in use in the roman church, have been collected by the contributions partly of ignorant and superstitious zea-

It is true, our duty calls us to oppose errors of all kinds as well as those of popery. But we

lots, and partly of dying men and women, terrified or allured by the doctrines of Purgatory and Indulgences, to purchase their future peace at the hands of designing priests, who are base and abject enough to enrich their churches and fraternities sometimes by reducing poor widows and orphans, who should have inherited these donations, to the extremest distress and misery. What can be meaner than the practices of their begging friars, who, as Dr. Middleton observes, " are always about the streets, and never fail to " carry home a good sack full of provisions for the use of their con- " vent." *Letter from Rome*, p. 220. This trade is copied, as the Doctor remarks, from their predecessors the priests of paganism. But, as the same writer informs us, " Cicero, in his book of Laws, " restrains this practice of begging or gathering alms to one particu- " lar order of priests [of *Cybele*], and that only on certain days ; " because, as he says, it propagates superstition, and impoverishes " families." Which, by the way, may let us see the policy [and I add, therein the superlative meanness] of the church of Rome, " in " the great care they have taken to multiply their begging orders." The meanness of popery is indeed the principal idea which this *Letter from Rome* exhibits, from the beginning to the end. It is impossible for a reader of it to consider the roman clergy in any higher character than that of jugglers shewing their tricks for money, with this infamous difference on the part of the priests, that under the mask of religion, they would make all their impostures pass for realities, and thereby incur the guilt of numerous and substantial evils introduced into society, of which the honester, and oftentimes the more dextrous, *charlatan* stands acquitted. It is very certain that many of the more liberal and generous of that communion have been scandalized at some of these contemptible practices, and have occasionally expressed their disgust: but still it seems it is thought necessary to continue them, upon the pitiful pretence, that, without such circumstances, religion would make very slender impressions on the minds of the people ; which indeed is likely enough to be true, considering with what industry the poor people are kept in ignorance, that religious impressions may not be made upon them by any better means. But the truth is, these impositions are far more necessary for the priests themselves. The management of them is the *craft by which they have their wealth ;* and to preserve that, nothing so mean, or childish, or ridiculous, or knavish, which may not be attempted. Dr. Middleton observes, that father Mabillon, a learned Frenchman, and a priest, had never seen the ceremony of sprinkling beasts of labour

are to consider that the errors of other sects are very differently founded. They do not, like the papists, appeal to an infallible judge, but to the scriptures considered as a rule of religion

with holy water upon a certain annual festival, " when all the in-" habitants of the city [Rome] and neighbourhood send up their " horses, asses, &c. to the convent of St. Anthony—where a priest " in a surpliee, at the church-door, sprinkles with his brush all " the animals singly, as they are presented to him, and receives from " each owner a gratuity proportionable to his zeal and abilities." —Mabillon was surprized at this ceremony, as well as many other parts of their worship, which he had never seen, till he travelled into Italy.—" But," says the Doctor, " if these men of learning and " teachers of religion know so little of what is done at Rome, how easy " must it be to impose upon the poor catholics of England, and keep " them in the dark, as to the more exceptionable parts of their wor-" ship, which are openly avowed and practised abroad, to the scandal " of all the candid and moderate of their own communion." *Letter*, p. 141, and *Pref. Discourse*, p. xvi. Nothing surely can be more base and unmanly than to keep our fellow-creatures in ignorance, that we may with the more facility make a sordid gain of them. It is the meanness of a common cheat, and for which an ordinary tradesman would lose his reputation, and a practice, which, in a pretended teacher of religion, deserves a worse punishment than the pillory. But it must be owned that the Lay-papists of England are not much less mean than the priests themselves, in submitting to be chousèd by such conjuring work, especially in a country where they may make a fair examination, without standing in awe of the thunder of the vatican, or the familiars of an holy office. The indignities to which some of our roman catholics, not of the lowest rank, are often obliged to submit, in deference to an insolent imperious priest, cannot with all their caution be so concealed, but that they will occasionally transpire. And what wonder? " In the papers of Sheldon, superior of the " Jesuits, seized in November 1745, are proofs of commands being " obeyed, when gentlemen of the first rank and their chaplains have " been both averse to a separation. None are allowed to chuse their " own priests, nor to retain them any longer than is agreeable to the " pleasure of the superior." What meanness in a free-born Englishman! See a remarkable instance of the tyranny exercised by the superior ecclesiastics over the the inferior popish clergy, in a very interesting *address to their graces the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, &c.* just published, printed for Becket and De Hondt, p. 12, 13.

to protestants in general; and every one having the liberty of searching and studying these, the questions among protestant churches must be determined by these sacred records, or not at all. And it may happen that they who differ from our establishment may, in some points, and those of no little consequence, have as good or better authority of the scriptural kind than ourselves. This as members of a protestant church, we must allow to be possible, unless we will say at once that we are infallible, and have the same authority to dictate to all dissenters that popery pretends to.

But as, without a pretence to such unwarrantable authority, the differences among protestant societies must still subsist, here is not only room, but an absolute necessity for that mutual forbearance which popery will not admit of. There are indeed circumstances in popish worship, which exclude us from any christian fellowship with those who practice it. The scriptures prohibit all religious intercourse with idolaters; and indeed, considering the prophetical warnings to *come out* from those who are infected with this *abomination*, which are applied by the Apostle Paul to the state of the first christian societies, no man can be too cautious, that he do not forfeit the precious promises given to those who keep themselves undefiled with it.

No objections of this nature lie against any of our protestant dissenters. All that they desire is to abound in their own sense of scripture, as we do in ours. This upon original protestant principles, cannot be denied them; and upon this bottom, their dissenting from us ei-

ther in doctrine or worship, founded as their pretensions to it are, and their sincerity in examining for themselves (a matter out of the reach of human judgment) being presupposed, is no more to be found fault with, than our dissenting from them.

For the rest, it is perhaps as much owing to political contingencies as to any thing else, that our system was, and theirs was not, established by civil authority ;* and neither the course of the world, nor the principles of its inhabitants, seem to be in so settled a condition, as absolutely to exclude the possibility of material alterations in the present state both of our public policy and public religion. Popery is more than supposed to have gained ground upon us considerably within the last twenty years. If a farther increase of this wretched superstition should ever bring on another crisis of the protestant religion, protestants of all denominations must unite in the defence of their common interest, when it may be found necessary to bolt the door more firmly against the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, to make more room in our ecclesiastical establishment for all the well-wishers to civil and religious liberty, by removing all those circumstances in our worship and discipline, which may seem, though but in appearance, to give

* In the convocation of 1562, the abrogation of all holidays, except Sunday, and of the croſs in baptiſm, diſpenſations with reſpect to the ſurplice, and kneeling at the communion, the total diſuſe of organs, were ſolicited with zeal and freedom; and the queſtion concerning theſe ceremonies was carried in their favour only by one vote, and that the vote of a proxy. Whereas there was on the other ſide a majority of eight, of thoſe who were preſent, and heard the debate. *Burnet, Hiſt. Reform. Vol. III.*

countenance to the rites and impositions of popery, sanctified by nothing but a groundless church-authority.

In the mean time, it is an obligation equally incumbent upon the members of the church of England and the protestant dissenters from it, to be vigilant against the common adversary, and consequently to unite in the strictest bonds of friendship and benevolence. Our christian liberty on both sides depends on supporting our gracious King and his free and equal government, against all attempts, whether directed against his person, or the civil and religious rights and privileges of the people under his protection. In this light all protestants are doubly brethren, the sons of one common father, and the happy subjects of one common sovereign. Popery is equally an enemy to all protestant establishments, as well as to all protestant sects; and in our system has never found a surer game to play, than that of exasperating protestants of one persuasion against those of another. Hitherto, by the good providence of God, this policy hath miscarried. The papists are evidently beginning the same game again.* It is our wisdom, and will be our safety, to be aware of them in time, and to cultivate such a measure of good-will and con-

* This is evident from their late printed pleas for toleration, wherein they affect to set the principles of the protestant dissenters, and particularly their enmity to the church of England, in the most invidious light; building thereon a claim of nearer kindred to our ecclesiastical constitution, and a reason *a fortiori* for greater indulgence from it. And in this they may perhaps appear to some people to have succeeded, by the many virulent things which have appeared of late in the public prints against the dissenters; but written undoubtedly by the papists themselves, under the mask of churchmen.

fidence among all protestants, that none of that denomination, however distinguished, may have reason to complain of being driven into the snare by our untractable disaffection and distrust of them, when it has been and still is so very evident that they cannot deserve it.

To conclude: we seem, in matters of religion, to be arrived at a very interesting crisis, wherein the prophecy of our blessed Saviour, namely, that, *because of the abounding of iniquity, the love of many should wax cold,* is fulfilled among *us*, as visibly at least as it has been among christians of any other period since the prophecy was delivered. There seems to be at this time not only a general coolness towards the protestant religion, as distinguished from the spirit and practices of popery, but likewise a general inattention to those interests of the temporal as well as of the spiritual kind, which it was the glory and praise of our ancestors to support.

Unhappily for the public, as well as individuals, the fashion of the times prevails too often in religion, as well as in matters of less importance. The word of God, for which the poor people hungred and thirsted in the beginning of the reformation, now that it is set open to every one with the greatest freedom, seems, in too many instances, to be despised and neglected, like other things, which lose their value, when they lose their novelty. Many seem now even to pride themselves in their ignorance, and to think themselves happy in being able to excuse their ungodly, fraudulent, or immoral practices, on the pretence of wanting learning, or what they call scholarship; un-

mindful that he who is wilfully ignorant of his Lord's will, when he may have the opportunity of learning it, will be beaten with as many stripes, as he who knows it, and doth it not; and that the few stripes mentioned in the parable are allotted to those only, from whom their master's will is concealed by some unavoidable obstruction or incapacity.*

* That I may not be ſuſpected of a want of candor, it may be proper to mention the appearance of a more edifying ſpirit among certain ſocieties which have riſen up among us in theſe latter times. It is ſaid, and I hope with great truth, that numbers of the common people have been ſo far converted by thoſe who labour in forming theſe ſocieties, as to put on a more ſerious and pious deportment, and to abſtain from many open inſtances of licentiouſneſs, for which they were notorious in times paſt. With reſpect to the doctrines taught in theſe ſocieties, it is no ſmall recommendation of them that they are pretended to be the genuine doctrines of the firſt reformers of the church of England; the principal of which however is, that the ſcriptures are the only authoritative rule of faith and practice to the chriſtian man. How far they have juſtified theſe pretenſions in their teachings and conduct, it is at preſent out of my way to inquire. It is natural for the members of an eſtabliſhed church to be alarmed on the riſe of any new ſect, to remark and cenſure its deviations from the common forms, and to ſhew and reprehend the ill effects of its peculiarities. Accordingly the methodiſts have been blamed for a want of charity towards thoſe of a different perſuaſion from themſelves; for conſigning particular perſons to condemnation; for being extremely peremptory and dogmatical in their interpretations of ſcripture; for making pretenſions to ſpiritual illuminations, of which they can give no ſufficient proof. It is indeed to be apprehended that they may have given but too juſt occaſion for theſe cenſures, and that through a common failing incident to all who pay more attention to artificial ſyſtems of theology, than to the genuine ſenſe of ſcripture. But be their errors what they will, their induſtry in attending their diſciples, the impreſſions of piety they have made upon them, and the zeal they expreſs for the ſalvation of ſouls, are circumſtances worthy of our regard and imitation; and are a loud call upon us of the eſtabliſhed church, to take heed to ourſelves and to our doctrine, to double our diligence in raiſing a better ſpirit among our people, and to awaken both them and ourſelves from the ſlumber of ſecularity, which is ſo manifeſtly obſtructive of chriſtian edification.

On another hand, it has been observed, that a selfish spirit prevails too much in those concerns wherein our very constitution is at stake. "The public, say some people, is the last thing "that is cared for, even by those classes of "men, who, both by their station and abili-"ties, are under the highest obligations to "consult its welfare, without which individu-"als can have no security for their peace, their "property, or even their very existence."

This state of the case must turn the eyes and expectations of those who perceive the approaching effects of this indifference upon the clergy, of course. Their conduct will be marked by the judicious few, though the secular and slothful among them may be indulged and even applauded for conforming to the fashion of the times, by those who, shunning the light of the gospel themselves, neither understand their own duty nor that of their teachers; and who, desiring to be indulged in their turn, are ready enough to screen themselves under examples, who, they will say, would certainly direct them to a better practice, if a better practice was necessary.

But let no man deceive himself with vain words. In any general calamity, such as a return of popery would bring upon us, even these thoughtless men must suffer as well as others, either by submitting to a remorseless ecclesiastical tyranny, or by a merciless vengeance for opposing it, and will then be sufficiently awake to see clearly from whence their sufferings are derived; and would be the first to reproach those who have flattered them in their slumbers, and complied with them in those

follies and dissipations, which now keep them secure and insensible of the common danger. It will be our happiness and our comfort in such an evil day, to have the testimony of our consciences that we have not ceased to warn every one, within our respective departments, of the just judgments of God upon those who either neglect the care of their salvation in the world to come, or undervalue the means of working it out to the greatest advantage, which have been so bountifully afforded, and so repeatedly preserved and rescued from the destructive jaws of popish tyranny and arbitrary power, by the vigilance of a gracious Providence, over this particular country, perhaps without example in any other.

APPENDIX.

NUMBER I.

An Account of a Popish Book, intituled, The Devotion to the Sacred Heart of JESUS, &c. *lately published, and dispersed with great Industry among the Roman Catholics of this Country.*

THEY who have pleaded for a free toleration of the papists in Great Britain, on the pretence of their disposition to submit to the present government, and their disclaiming the power of the Pope or church of Rome over the temporalities even of protestant princes,* have been obliged to answer to a very material objection, namely, that while the superstition, enthusiasm, and fanaticism of their people, with respect to visions, revelations, &c. of their pretended saints, arise to such a pitch of extra-

* See a letter in the *Public Ledger of Auguſt* 28, 1767, ſigned *A Lover of all Mankind*, and another in the *Gazetteer, Auguſt* 29, 1767, ſigned *Anti-Draco*.

vagance, there can be no depending upon any principles they may espouse, upon the foundation of reason, or even of scripture. For the pretence of an immediate revelation from one of their saints, commanding the most absurd and wicked thing imaginable, must at once cancel all general obligations arising from the tenor either of human or divine laws, as hath been oftentimes proved by various instances, particularly among the devotees of the jesuits; and as a large majority of their stationed priests in England are of that order, the government will have every thing to fear from the impressions those fathers make upon their people by impositions of that kind.

In answer to this we are told, "that the papists are not so superstitious and bigoted with "respect to the forms of devotion to their reputed saints as heretofore; that the imposture of "pretended visions and revelations has been "detected and disgraced more lately among "themselves;" and we have seen above, that great stress is laid upon the modern papists not being so much under the influence of their priests as in former times.

What reformation the papists may have made in their politics, we shall never be able to learn, but from some public and explicit renunciation of their former principles; that no modification of their ancient fanaticism hath as yet taken place among them, will appear by the specimens of it in the performance upon which I am about to remark, which, being calculated for the edification of English and Irish papists, may possibly furnish us with a reason, why our predecessors were so strict in

prohibiting the importation of popish books; upon a conviction, no doubt, that they, who could give into such abject superstition with the zeal and enthusiasm that is here prescribed, might easily be wrought up into any attempts upon the religion and government of a race of heretics, who are taught to hold these solemnities in contempt and derision. The title of this curious publication is as follows:

The Devotion to the Sacred Heart of JESUS; *with other pious Practices, devout Prayers, and Instructions, for the use and convenience of Christians in general. With Permission of Superiors.* BRUGES, by *Joseph Van Praet.* 1765.

Opposite to this title-page is a shocking print, representing JESUS CHRIST, with the breast cut open, and the heart laid bare, surrounded with what is called a glory; and this appears, by what follows in the book, to be the very image to which they who practice this devotion pay their adoration.

The book begins with the following account:

"SECT. I. *Concerning the Institution of "the Devotion.*

"TheDevotion to the sacred heart of Jesus, "the feast whereof is kept on the Friday fol "lowing the octave of the blessed sacrament, "has been promoted and authorized by several "popes, of whom some have granted a plenary "indulgence to such as shall visit the churches "of the religious of the visitation of our blessed "lady on the said feast," &c.

It will be proper to inform the protestant reader, that the orders of monks and nuns in

popish countries, being very numerous, and every one zealous for the honour of his or her particular institution, there naturally arises a rivalship among them, which of them shall have the greatest number of lay-votaries attached to their order. For which purpose they attempt to institute some peculiar solemnity or devotion, of which some saint of their own order, or some particular transaction or incident of the saint's life or history, is the foundation.

But it is to be observed, that these particular devotions, to make them authentic, must have the approbation of the pope; who, if he can be prevailed with to give it, annexes certain privileges or indulgencies to the practice of such devotions, which are understood to be communicated to those who practise them according to the form prescribed.

But, forasmuch as these devotions are apt to occasion strifes and variances between different religious communities, the popes have frequently refused to authorise such of them as might seem to interfere with the interest or reputation of some other order or orders, the principals of which have often interposed, and remonstrated against the establishment of such new devotions as they apprehended might lessen the credit or importance of their own fraternity.

Accordingly we see here, that this devotion of the sacred heart hath only been authorised by several popes, and that only some of those several have granted a plenary indulgence in favour of it. And we shall see presently, that even this precious devotion was under a cloud at Rome from July 30, 1729, to February 6, 1765. But to proceed with the introduction.

"Though this solemnity may appear new, "yet the devotion is far from being so, and has "ever been the constant practice of many most "eminent saints of the church of God, St. "Bernard, St. Clare, St. Catharine of Sienna, "St. Elzear, St. Francis of Assissum, St. Bo- "naventure."

After which he exhibits several fanatical expressions of these pretended saints; such as drawing from this devotion the most alluring sweetness and consolation.—Being all on fire with the love of Jesus, as often as she thought of this adorable heart.—Would you know where your Elzear is? Seek me in the heart of Jesus; there I make my usual abode.

But, as the design of this publication is to do particular honour to the Jesuits, the catalogue of saints devoted to the heart is closed with four of that fraternity; namely, St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Francis Xaverius, St. Philip Nerius, St. Aloysius Gonzaga. Canonizations of Jesuits have not been frequent; and I question whether, at the time this book was published, there were more than these four saints of that order in the Roman calendar.* But they are enough for the purpose of amusing the silly catholics of England and Ireland, who, conceiving that the beatification of these fa-

* However, to balance the disgrace of the Jesuits in other quarters, his holiness, it seems, is in the humour to gratify them with one additional saint at least, as appears by the following extract of a letter from Rome, published in the Public Ledger, April 1, 1767. "While several states of Europe are expelling and insulting the Je- "suits, this city is canonizing them. On Monday next, another "saint will be added to the Golden Legend, viz. Father Francis de "Jerome, who has performed several surprising miracles, as well "since as before his death." The letter from Rome is dated March 7.

thers must imply the sanctity of the whole order, would be the more scandalized at the expulsion of the Jesuits from France and Portugal; a point to which these crafty politicians were to be very attentive at this crisis.

"Whoever," says this compiler, "reads the "lives of these saints, must necessarily ob- "serve the tender devotion they had to the "sacred heart of Jesus."

Had I been of counsel with this author, I could have helped him to another saint, to add to this venerable groupe; even the pious St. John Baptist Girard, who (as his process sets forth), "in order to conceal his sacrilegious "and incestuous flame, said to Miss Cadiere, "let us love one another dearly, in the sacred "heart of Jesus. And hence it comes, says "Cadiere's apologist, that all those love-let- "ters in the Appendix to the proceedings, con- "clude with these words, *I am intimately "united with you, in the* SACRED HEART OF "JESUS."*

But to proceed with the account before us, "Jesus Christ," says this abominable book,

* John Baptist Girard, a Jesuit, rector of the royal seminary of chaplains of the navy at Toulon, was tried by the parliament of Provence, in the year 1731, for spiritual incest with his penitent Mary Catharine Cadiere, the consequence of which being the pregnancy of the said Cadiere, he was further charged with giving her drugs to procure an abortion. The facts were clearly and punctually proved by sufficient evidence. Twelve of his twenty-four judges would have condemned him to be burned alive; three voted for the galleys, or perpetual banishment, and nine for his acquittal. The interest, or perhaps the purse, of the Jesuits prevailed in favour of this last verdict; and thus this profligate priest escaped, not by the equitable sentence of the law, but by the corrupt interposition of his own fraternity, who, for their own honour, should have been the first to bring him to justice.

" who had formerly, by his inspiration, invited " only some particular saints to this amiable " devotion to his sacred heart, reserved the " manifestation of it to these latter times, as " he revealed to St. Gertrude, that it might " be a means to draw the faithful out of that " extreme tepidity, into which he foresaw they " would degenerate."

What a representation of the blessed Saviour of the world! He foresees the extreme tepidity into which the faithful would degenerate; he knows the means to draw them out of it; and yet withholds this precious remedy for seventeen hundred years from all the world except a few of his favourites, and communicates his intention of manifesting it in these latter ages only to a silly obscure woman, without any view that appears, of its going farther, till it broke out in the manner following.

" Sister Mary Margaret, a religious of the " visitation of our blessed lady, in the monas- " tery of Paroi, a town in the Dutchy of Bur- " gundy, who died the 17th of October, 1690, " in the odour of sanctity, in the 42d year of " her age, was the person whom the Saviour of " the world chose to make known to the faith- " ful his designs concerning the devotion of " the heart. This holy soul, whom God had " replenished with many singular graces, and " who, in an eminent manner, corresponded " with them, being one day within the octave " of *Corpus Christi*, before the blessed sacra- " ment, and more affected than ordinary with " the contemplation of God, had a most ear- " nest desire to make a suitable return for his " dear love towards us. Whereupon the Son

" of God told her, she could not testify her " gratitude in a more acceptable manner than " in doing what he had so often required, and " then disclosing his sacred heart to her, said, " —See here the heart which has so tenderly " loved mankind, and spared nothing even to " the wasting and consuming itself, in testi- " mony of its love, and yet in return I gene- " rally meet with nothing but ingratitude, " contempt, sacrileges, irreverences, and cold- " ness, even in the very sacrament of my love; " and still what more sensibly affects me, is, " that great part of these indignities are sent " back from those hearts which are consecrated " to me. Wherefore I demand of you, in or- " der to procure my glory, that the first Friday " after the octave of the blessed sacrament, be " appointed a particular and solemn festival, " on which, by some agreeable return, my " heart may be honoured, and the indignities " offered to it, whilst it has been so often ex- " posed on the altars in the holy sacrament, " be repaired. I promise it will more abun- " dantly dilate its love on all such as shall in- " terest themselves in this reparation of ho- " nour."

This impudent, blasphemous lie, was, it seems, too monstrous to gain credit sufficient to procure its authentication from the Holy See. And therefore the writer of the book, foreseeing that his authority for this incredible narrative might be called for, was necessitated to make the following excuse for his hardiness, in a marginal note.

" As the church does not pronounce on the " authenticity of this revelation, or the sanc-

" tity of the person to whom it was made, in " order to conform, as I ought, to the wise " regulations of the Holy See, I only relate " this as an historical fact, yet so certain and " averred, as to challenge deservedly our be- " lief and adherence. We speak as formerly " the faithful spoke of the revelation of St. " Juliana, which gave rise to the solemnity of " the feast of *Corpus Christi.*"

Behold the artifice of the Jesuit! The church saith he, doth not pronounce on the authenticity, &c. How so? Why, perhaps, the church hath not been apprised of the revelation, or hath not been applied to, to authenticate it. And yet the hint of the wise regulations of the Holy See, leave little room to doubt but that application had been made to it both to authenticate the revelation, and to canonize Sister Mary Margaret. The truth is, the politic Romans are, for some time by-past, grown cautious how they give credit and sanction to such bare-faced impostures; besides, it appears in the progress of the narrative, that the establishment of this devotion had been actually opposed at Rome, most probably on account of its being patronized by, and calculated to raise the reputation and promote the interests of, the Jesuits. In the mean time, whilst the revelation remains in the naked condition of an historical fact, the transmarine catholics know they may believe as much or as little of it as they please; and accordingly this devotion hath never been in any great repute in France, though the lie was forged there, and has, no doubt, been in still less, since the infamous use made of it by the Jesuit Girard abovemention-

ed. It has now crossed the sea to England, where the forgers of it know very well, there are plenty of poor catholics, ready to swallow whatever their priests prepare for them, how difficult soever of digestion to the stomachs of their brethren abroad.

But the most diverting circumstance in this apologetical note, is the parallel the author draws between Sister Mary's revelation and that of St. Juliana, a part of whose history will not be unedifying to those who desire to understand what progress our Roman catholic countrymen have made, in ridding their system of the legendary trash espoused by their forefathers.

"This saint, or as she is likewise called Mo-
"ther Juliana, lived in an hospital hard by the
"town of Liege, and had many extasies and
"raptures, and so prophetical a spirit, as to
"discern the thoughts and intentions of her
"neighbours hearts; she wrestled with devils,
"discoursed with the apostles, and wrought
"many miracles. But one thing peculiar to
"her was, that in her prayers she almost al-
"ways saw the moon in her brightness, but
"with a snip taken off from her roundness, at
"which she was much troubled, but by no
"means could get out of her fancy. At last
"God was pleased to reveal it to her, that the
"moon signified the present church, and the
"fraction the want of one solemnity more to
"be observed in it. Upon which she received
"a command from heaven, to proclaim the ob-
"servation of this solemnity. For twenty
"years she prayed to God to excuse her, and
"to make choice of a more worthy person;

" but none being found, she communicates it
" to *Johannes de Lausenna*, and he to *Jacobus*
" *de Tricis*, then Archdeacon of Leige, and
" afterwards Pope Urban IV. But although
" the persons to whom it was communicated
" highly approved it, yet she was not satis-
" fied till one of her gossips, named Isabella,
" after a whole year's praying for it, had the
" same thing revealed to her, with that cir-
" cumstance, that this feast had always been
" among the secrets of the B. Trinity, but now
" the time was come when it should be pub-
" lished to the world; and she, in one of her
" extasies, saw very distinctly, all the heavenly
" orders upon their faces, supplicating God,
" that, to confirm the faith of christians, this
" day might be speedily observed. This Isa-
" bella was so much intoxicated by this vi-
" sion, saith the author, that out of the abun-
" dance of her spiritual drunkenness (they are
" his own words) she declared she would pro-
" mote the observing this feast although the
" whole world should oppose her. Which we
" may well think Juliana rejoiced to hear,
" and henceforwards they joined counsels to
" advance this solemnity. Juliana gets an ig-
" norant young priest to draw up an office for
" it, and while he wrote, she prayed, by which
" means the office was so well composed, that
" it would melt, saith he, the hardest hearts
" into devotion; and when it was seen by di-
" vines, they said it was not written by man,
" but inspired by God himself. And yet when
" Pope Urban published his bull upon the cre-
" dit of these revelations, for the celebration
" of this feast, he appointed Thomas Aquinas

" to compose an office for it, and rejected that " divine office of Juliana."*

Behold the honourable origin of the feast of *Corpus Christi*, one of the most venerable solemnities in the church of Rome. A tale which is appealed to by the craftsman under consideration, by way of keeping his revelation of the sacred heart in countenance; as who should say, if sister Mary Margaret told a lie, mother Juliana and her gossip Isabel told a bigger. And if they had the address to get a feast founded on their fable, why shall not we pretend to have a devotion established for ours? To what a pitiable ignorance must those poor creatures be reduced who can suffer themselves to be deluded by such gross absurdities? We now go on with sister Mary Margaret.

" This pious soul, being all in confusion, " would fain have excused herself on account " of her unworthiness, but was soon made sen- " sible, that Providence, to the end no one " should seem important in his own eyes, " makes use of the most feeble instruments for " the bringing about its greatest designs. At " the same time she was inspired to communi- " cate the affair to father Claud la Colombiere, " of the society of Jesus, who died on the " 15th of February, 1682, and whose eminent " sanctity and excellent writings still preserve " his memory fresh in the minds of the faith- " ful."

Here the cat peeps out of the bag. A jesuit is pitched upon as the proper person to mani-

* Stillingfleet's discourse of the idolatry of the church of Rome, octavo, 1671, p. 255, 256, who quotes three popish authors for it.

fest this devotion to the world, and pitched upon by inspiration too; a very seasonable lift to the society, which was now sinking in its estimation all over Europe. The French jesuits in particular had no resource but among the poor dupes of Great Britain and Ireland, and with these, this was a sure bait to preserve their credit, more particularly considering the station and character of this father Claud, of which our author gives this account.

"The holy man, full of the Spirit of God, "not content in hearing from the mouth of "the religious all that passed as above-men- "tioned, obliged her moreover to deliver "the same in writing. This done, and reflect- "ing on the elevated virtue of the person, *on "one side, and on the other*, considering the "excellence of the devotion so proper for "kindling the fire of divine love, he judged "the whole was from God, and accordingly "received it as a devotion inspired by the "Holy Ghost, delivering down to posterity "the singular lights, heaven had inspired him "with on this subject in a spiritual retreat he "made at London in the year 1677."

So then this precious devotion was licked into form at London, a very singular recommendation of it, no doubt to the English catholics. The man would have clinched it more effectually had he given the revelation to an English devotee. But this it should seem was impossible. The female catholics of England, we are to suppose, have *elevated virtue* only *on one side*, and that would not have gone cleverly down with French pietists. But the devotion being conceived in Burgundy, and

born in London, both nations may claim kindred with it, and so join amicably in the propagation of it; and so it turns out. For,—

"The peculiar graces he (father Claud) received on this occasion, and the repeated "instances the said holy religious woman had "from our blessed Saviour for advancing this "work, effectually convinced him of the will "of God, in this design: in consequence, "he applied his utmost endeavours towards "establishing this devotion in France and "also in England, during the time he continued there in quality of preacher to the then "Duchess of York, afterwards Queen of England. In effect, this devotion began to spread, "in spite of all opposition, and in less than a "year, France beheld it happily established. "The faithful were pleased in seeing pictures "of the sacred heart drawn and dispersed, "prints cut and engraved, chapels erected, "and altars consecrated to its honour, with "the general approbation of all."

Matters clear up upon us apace. We now learn what business this Jesuit *La Colombiere* had in England, namely, to assist the Duke of York in the pious project of converting this heretical kingdom. We learn, moreover, that this devotion met with a spiteful opposition in France: but at length, it seems, after a struggle for a year or so, it procured an establishment in that country, if drawing pictures, striking prints of the sacred heart, erecting chapels, and consecrating altars to its honour, may be so called, which is very much to be doubted. The catholics of Britain, I am told, are a little squeamish on these occasions, particularly such of them as do not partake of the merits of the jesuitical order. They chuse to see the

ring of the fisherman to establishments; and the general approbation of all in France, even if that were true, does not imply the general approbation of all in Rome. Not to mention that the devotion of the *sacred heart* may be said to be thus far established in this protestant country by the dispersion of this foolish book. For the English catholics have their pictures, prints, chapels and altars, as well as the French.

The prefacing Jesuit, aware of this scruple, endeavours to stop the gap, by saying, that "the devotion of the sacred heart, in spite of "all the efforts of our infernal enemy, and "dissolute corruptions of the world, has gained "an ascendency throughout the whole church. "—The same is publicly practised in every "catholic country of the universe, and even "at Rome itself, under the eyes of the vicar "of Jesus Christ."

Very possibly; for the said vicar, we are informed, hath got a scurvy custom of winking, and sleeping a dog's sleep, when he does not chuse to see every thing under his eyes.

But though the devotion of the *sacred heart* could get no passport from Rome, it obtained, we are told, another from heaven, which should in all reason, have been as satisfactory to the devotees, as one from Rome. For this we have the word of no less a man than *Joseph Languet* bishop of *Soissons*, afterwards promoted to be Archbishop of *Sens*, who took the pains to write the life of Sister Mary Margaret at large.*

* In *L'Etat de la France*. published 1718, vol. III. p. 166. This R. R. prelate, is called *Jean Joseph Languet de la Villeneuve de Gergy, Abbé de Coëtmaloen, Docteur en Théologie, de la Maison de Navarre.*

According to this biographer, "our blessed "Redeemer spoke to her as follows.

"I am much pleased in the devotion the "faithful shew for my heart, and for this rea- "son I desire the picture thereof may be drawn "and exposed, that, by this so amiable a re- "presentation, the hearts of men may be sof- "tened into repentance. I promise that such "as in a more particular manner shall honour "this picture, shall partake more amply of "those graces with which my heart is replen- "ished." See p. 46.

Here we have the blessed Redeemer of the world represented as injoining an act of down-right idolatry; for such does the honour paid to this picture plainly turn out, as appears by the following direction for an association in honour of the sacred heart. No. VIII. p. 46.

"Every associate should have in his house "or chamber a picture of the sacred heart. "The advantage among others, is this; should "any particular be hindered from visiting the "blessed sacrament, he may before this picture "acquit himself of the obligation he hath vo- "luntarily taken upon himself. Jesus Christ "has given us an instance and proof of how "great merit this practice is in his sight." *Ibid.* And then follows the passage quoted above out of Sister Mary Margaret's Life, written by the bishop of Soissons.

What honour is paid by the Romanists to what they call the blessed sacrament, or the host, every one knows, who hath seen their rituals, or has been present at mass, either at home or abroad. But even the catholics them-

selves acknowledge, that to adore an unconsecrated host is idolatry, since, without such consecration, the miracle of transubstantiation is not performed.* Now whatever honour is paid to the holy sacrament at such time of visitation as is mentioned above, is here directed to be paid to the picture of the sacred heart; which being unconsecrated, and consequently untransubstantiated, cannot, even upon the principles of popery, pretend to the honours

* The following narrative, written in 1682, is an instance in point. "A woman that lives in Tours, and was melancholy, and "full of vapours, desired to receive the sacrament every day, in "which, she said, she found most wonderful consolation. The priest "has the reputation of a very worthy man, and being a judicious "person, he clearly saw through the poor woman's weakness and "superstition, and was willing enough to do what he thought an in-"nocent fraud, and might give the distempered person some ease, and "yet not tend to a prophanation of holy things; so, instead of the "sacrament, he gave her unconsecrated wafers, which she received "with her ordinary devotion, and they had the ordinary effects on "her. But as Frenchmen are too apt to tell their own secrets, the "curate made himself merry with some of his friends upon this oc-"casion, and told how he had deceived the hypochondriacal woman. "So the thing got wind, and was looked on as a great impiety in "the priest to suffer one to commit such idolatry to a piece of bread, "to which, no doubt, she offered the same adoration that was due, if "it had been consecrated. So the curate was cited before the "archbishop of Tours, where he had met with a severe censure, if "the esteem he is justly in, had not preserved him.——But he was "condemned to six months imprisonment," &c. *News from France*, p. 14, 15, in the first volume of bishop Burnet's Tracts in quarto. The bishop was in France when this happened, and having told the story, he offers the following reflexion upon it to his correspondent. "I leave it to you, and your most learned friend when you meet, to "consider, if this is acknowledged to be idolatry in this melancholy "woman, to worship a piece of bread, which she verily believed was "the body of Christ; then whether it will not certainly follow that "the whole church of Rome is guilty of idolatry, if Christ is not "corporally present in the host, and that their adoring him as pre-"sent will not excuse them from idolatry, if he is not really present."

due to the consecrated host ; and therefore the worship paid to it by this direction, must be idolatrous, since, according to the instance in the margin, the intention of the worshipper cannot excuse the crime, where the object is incompetent.*

At length, however, it seems, the present Pope was prevailed with to give a sanction to this devotion in Poland, at the instance of the bishops of that kingdom, the tenor of which, as it is printed in a blank leaf between pages 72 and 73, is as follows:

Decretum Poloniæ.

"Instantibus pro concessione Officii et Missæ SSmi *Cordis Jesu* plerisque reverendissimis episcopis Regni Poloniæ, nec non Archi-confraternitate urbis sub hoc titulo erecta; Congregatio sacrorum Rituum habita die 26 Januarii hujus anni probe noscens cultum Cordis Jesu jam hodie esse per omnes fere Catholici Orbis partes, foventibus earum episcopis, propagatum, sæpe etiam a sede apostolica decoratum millenis Indulgentiarum Brevibus, datis ad innumeras propemodum confraternitates, sub titulo Cordis Jesu, canonice erectas; simulque intelligens hujus Officii et Missæ non aliud agi quam ampliari cultum jam institutum; et symbolice renovari memoriam illius divini amoris quo unigenitus Dei filius humanam suscepit

* In the litany to the *Sacred Heart*, p. 27. are the following expreſſions.—*Refuge of Sinners.—Fortitude of the Juſt.—Comfort of the afflicted.—Main Strength of the tempted.—Terror of Devils.—Sanctification of Hearts.—Perſeverance of the Good.—Hope of the dying.—Joy of the bleſſed.—Delight of all the Saints*—Have mercy on us.

naturam, et fectus obediens usque ad mortem, præbere se dixit exemplum hominibus quod esset mitis et humilis corde. His de causis, referente eminentissimo et reverendissimo Cardinali Episcopo Sabinensi, audito R. P. D. Cajetano Forti Promotore, Fidei, PRÆVIO RECESSU A DECISIS SUB DIE 30 JULII 1729, annuendum precibus censuit Episcoporum Regni Poloniæ, et dictæ Archi-confraternitatis urbis deliberatum deinceps de Officio et Missa rite approbandis. Quod quidem Congregationis votum per me Secretarium relatum Domino nostro Clementi Papæ XIII. sanctitas sua, hujus etiam Decreti tenore perlecto, in omnibus approbavit. Hac die 6to. Februarii, 1765. *Joseph Maria, Card. Feroni, Præfectus. S. Burghesius, S. R. C. Secretarius. Loco + Sigilli.*"

The compiler of this devotion informs us, that "the above sheets were drawn off, before "this decree came to his hand." He does not, however, omit to avail himself of it, as an additional lure to the British catholics, observing, that, "the approbation of his holiness, especi- "ally on so solemn an occasion, cannot but "be an object of the greatest importance to "the catholic reader, who may discover the "brightest light reflected from it on the matter "he has treated, and a remarkable weight ad- "ded to the motives inducing them to the "practice of this holy devotion."

But why then is not this decree given in english as well as the rest of the book? or what light can it reflect to a reader who does not understand latin?

Be it known then to the english reader, whether protestant or catholic, 1. That this decree authorises this devotion no where but in the kingdom of Poland, at a sufficient distance from his holiness, and the congregation of sacred rites, not to scandalize the good catholics of Portugal, France, and other countries where the devotions of the Jesuits were in no reputation. The occasion was this: in 1764 the Polish Dissidents confederated, "and employed "their utmost efforts to be restrained in their "rights, and the greatest part of the nuncios "had instructions to act in their favour. But," says my author, "it is universally known by "what an outrageous clamour the clergy not "only procured their demands to be rejected, "but," &c.* Divers circumstances however gave suspicions to the clergy that the Dissidents would not sit down quietly with this repulse; provision was therefore to be made against their future efforts to relieve themselves. On these occasions, where heresy is to be humbled, no coadjutors are equal to the Jesuits. Superstitions, like this of the *sacred heart*, work wonders by inflaming the minds of the ignorant populace, and by attaching them to the persons of those who communicate such venerable mysteries to them. We learn from the tenor of the decree itself that the jesuitical arch-confraternity at Rome had a principal hand in procuring it; and all these circumstances laid together, shew how seasonably this decree would come in aid of the Polish clergy

* See a pamphlet intitled, *Reflexions on the affairs of the Dissidents in Poland, printed at London*, 1767, p. 29.

and what weighty motives these considerations would afford to his holiness, and the congregation of the sacred rites, to lay aside their former scruples, and to stretch a point in order to humble the heretical and factions Dissidents. I call it *stretching a point*, as it is evident from the decree itself, that, on the 30th of July, 1729, a decision against the devotion of the sacred heart had been made by this very congregation of sacred rites, and consequently by the authority of the Pope, from which decision it was necessary to recede, before this decree could take place. In the mean time, we are presented with a remarkable contrast, between the millenary briefs of indulgences, with which this *devotion of the sacred heart* had been *often decorated by the See Apostolic*, and the decision of July, 1729, against the authenticity of it.

I leave it now to the consideration of the english and irish catholics whether this decree, calculated solely for the meridian of Poland, can reflect any new light upon the *devotion of the sacred heart* which they are authorised to follow, unless they and their good friends the Jesuits may have some such motives, with respect to these kingdoms, as induced the Pope to gratify the Polish clergy with the above-cited decree, and have some design to solicit his holiness for the like sanction for this devotion for England.

Nor indeed is this an improbable conjecture, for at page 259, we find the following supplications:

—"Give thy grace and blessing to all the "clergy, and send amongst them that heavenly

" fire, which thy Son came to cast on earth, " and which he so earnestly desired should be " enkindled. Assist and protect all apostolical " missionaries," &c.

That the Jesuits lay claim to be the leaders of all apostolical missionaries in virtue of their fourth vow, in which they promise *specialem obedientiam summo pontifici circa missiones*, is well known. It is not therefore without reason, or without sagacity, that a prayer for enkindling the fire upon earth, is followed by a petition for success to those who have the greatest quantity of combustibles in their storehouses, and the best dispositions to enkindle them.

In another place, p. 193, they are directed to pray for *union among christian princes,—the extirpation of heresy,—and exaltation for their holy mother the church.*

From these particulars it appears that though the *devotion to the sacred heart* is the *first* object in this publication which takes the attention of the reader, yet that it is far from being the *principal* object. If the manifestation of it were to have been committed to any other hands than those of a Jesuit, I will venture to say, the secret might have remained with Sister Mary Margaret to this hour. For that this compilation was put together merely to give the Jesuits consequence with the english papists, appears from the following forms.

Page 228. There is what is called a commemoration of St. Ignatius of Loyola [founder of the Jesuits], in these words:

" *Antiphone.* This man, despising the world, " and triumphing over earthly things, heaped

"up riches in heaven by word and work. *Ver-*
" *sicle.* The Lord loved and adorned him.
" *Respons.* A garment of glory he hath put
" on him.

" *The Prayer.*

" O God, who, for the greater glory of thy
" name, hast, by the blessed Ignatius, strength-
" ened the church militant with NEW AUXILI-
" ARIES, graciously vouchsafe that we by his
" assistance and imitation, solicitously com-
" bating upon earth, may obtain with him an
" everlasting crown in heaven."

It is not a little remarkable, that, while the catholics of other countries are expelling those *new auxiliaries* for their flagitious imitation of their founder St. Ignatius,* the good catholics of England should be praying to obtain an everlasting crown in heaven by virtue of such imitation.

Page 236, we have a devotion to St. *Aloysius Gonzaga* "for six Sundays without intermis-
" sion, in memory of the six years he lived in
" the society of Jesus." What his particular merit was, we learn from two of his titles in the litany appointed as a part of this devotion; viz. "Particular Client of St. Ignatius.—Most
" zealous observer of the rules." This St. Aloysius, it seems, "was canonized by Pope
" Benedict XIII. and indulgences granted
" thereupon by Clement XII, to encourage
" the devotion."

But the most complete of the jesuitical devotions here exhibited is the *Novena*, or nine

* For the true character of *Ignatius Loyola*, see *Le Catechifme des Jefuites*, written by *Stephen Paſquier*, a zealous Roman catholic, chap. xi, xii. xvii, xviii.

days devotion, allotted to St. *Francis Xaverius*, commonly called the Apostle of the Indies. "This *Novena*," we are told, p. 216, "commences on the fourth of March, and "continues nine days; that is, till the twelfth "of March, on which day, in the year 1622, "Pope Gregory XV canonized St. *Francis* "*Xaverius*."

A few of the abominable and impious idolatries of this particular devotion will serve to characterise it.

Page 223. for the first day this prayer is directed to be said:

"Most glorious St. *Francis Xaverius*, Apos-"tle of the Indies, if it be for the glory of "God, and thy honour, that I obtain what I "desire and beg by this *Novena*, obtain for "me this grace of our Lord; if not, guide my "petition, and beg of our Lord for me, that "which is most proper for his glory, and the "benefit of my soul."

Here we see the *honour* of a scurvy Monk, and in fact a notorious impostor,* set upon a level with the glory of the most high God. One would wish to know what would be the case, on the supposition that what is desired would be for the glory of God, and not for the honour of the dead Jesuit? And how the casuistical doctors of the church would salve this gross impiety, by the application of their ridiculous distinction between Αἰδεια and Δουλεια?

Page 224, 225. After a direction "to say "thrice the Lord's Prayer and three Hail Ma-"rys," the following prayer is prescribed:

* See *Le Catechifme des Jefuites*, chap. xvii.

" Most holy father St. *Francis Xaverius*, " who receivest the praises from the mouths of " innocent children, I most humbly implore " thy bountiful charity, for the sake of the most " precious blood of Jesus, and of the immacu- " late conception of our blessed lady, mother " of God, to the end thou mayest obtain of " God's infinite goodness, that at the approach " of my last hour my heart may be separated " and withdrawn from all worldly thoughts and " distractions, and be fixed in the most ardent " love of him, and a vehement desire of an " happy eternity, so that laying aside the mul- " tiplicity of earthly things which hitherto " have perplexed me, I may most diligently " seek, and perfectly find, that one thing which " is necessary, which is to die in rest and peace " under the protection of the most holy Virgin " Mary, in the wounds of Jesus her most " blessed Son, in the sweet embraces of my " God, and in thy presence, Holy Saint, " through whose intercession I hope to ob- " tain this mercy," &c. &c.

So then it should seem that the protection of Mary, the wounds of Jesus, and the embraces of God himself, will be of no avail without the presence of this Holy Saint.

However, it appears that this same Saint is a little shy of his favours, and must be kept in good humour by various compliments, particularly to his order: for at page 220, the supplicant is told, that "for the more effectual prevailing " with St. *Francis Xaverius*, it will be conve- " nient every day, to make a special comme- " moration of St. *Ignatius Loyola*, whom St.

" *Francis Xaverius* honoured, respected, and " loved, as his father, master, and superior."

And undoubtedly, at the same time that this commemoration is so convenient for the poor idolatrous performers of this *Novena*, it is not inconvenient for the pious, simple-minded fathers, who communicated these precious treasures of devotion to the roman catholics of this country.

Again, after the prayer above-cited, the rubric, page 226, directs, "in the next place, " you are to ask of St. *Francis Xaverius* the " particular favour you desire to obtain, *height-* " *ening, as much as in you is, your confidence* " *in him*, with such words as your affectionate " thoughts shall suggest, or with such aspira- " tions as your devotion shall dictate.—Then, " *the more to please this Holy Apostle*, in imi- " tation of him, say that prayer which he him- " self composed and used to say every day for " the conversion of the infidels."

What a deal of coaxing the soul of this Jesuit takes to be brought into any tolerable temper! If compassion for the poor deluded creatures whose heads and hearts are filled with this impious fanaticism did not check one's mirth, it would be pleasant enough to hear what words the affectionate thoughts of a young catholic female who desired an husband, or of a younger brother in want of an establishment, and who desired to find it in a lucky run in a gambling party, &c. would suggest to heighten their confidence in St. Francis Xavier. His intercession is not in the least confined to the spiritual desires of the votary; and this scope being given to the performer of the *Novena*,

it is not difficult to conceive what ridiculous, and perhaps profane, requests the poorer and more ignorant papists will put up to this jesuitical saint. Examples are not wanting of most shocking petitions even in the legends dispersed among the catholics in these days. However, if the thing requested is but obtained, let the means be what they will, we may be sure it will turn out to the honour of the saint, how little soever the glory of God is promoted by it.

Page 213. We have the litany of St. *Francis Xaverius*, in which are the following suffrages: *Destroyer of Idols.*—St. Francis Xaverius, *most worthy son of* Ignatius.—*Light of Infidels.*—*Martyr in desiring to die for Christ.*—*Confessor in Virtue and Profession of Life.*—DOCTOR OF GENTILES IN ALL SORTS OF LANGUAGES.

It is an easy kind of martyrdom to suffer only in desire; and with respect to Xavier's confessorship, we see it was only in virtue and profession of life. For that he was otherwise molested for preaching the gospel, either in the Indies or elsewhere, does not appear from any authentic memorials, nor indeed is pretended in those fictitious ones of Tursellin or others, which are full of fabulous accounts of Xavier's miracles.

Our compiler however makes us ample amends for this unnatural instance of jesuitical modesty in the last of the titles bestowed upon Xavier, namely, *Doctor of Gentiles in all sorts of Languages.* It is a strain of impudence peculiar to the Jesuits to ascribe to a man, characters and qualities, which he himself disowns,

and disowns with serious lamentations for the want of them.

What sort of a *Doctor of Languages* Xavier was among the Indian gentiles, he hath himself left a full account under his own hand.

"If," says he, "we understood the language of Japan, I doubt not but many would "become christians. God grant that we may "learn it in a short time; then we shall be able "to do something for the christian cause. "Now truly we live among them as so many "dumb statues: for they say and debate a "great deal concerning us, to which we are "silent. Being ignorant of their country "language, we are turning children again for "the present, that we may learn the first ele"ments of it."*

If any honest english catholic, after this, has faith to believe that Xavier was a *doctor of the gentiles in all sorts of languages*, (which, as the Jesuit *Acosta*, who was upon the Indian mission, affirmed, amounted to above seven hundred), he will make no difficulty in believing the miracles that the Jesuit *Bouhours* retails in his life of *Xavier*, from *Horatius Tursellin*, and others. "Neither Jesus Christ," says *Pasquier*, "whilst he was upon earth, nor, "after his ascension, St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, "wrought so many miracles, as *Xavier* did in "the Indies;" of which he gives a pleasant

* Si nos linguam calleremus Japonicam, non dubito, quin plurimi fierent Chriſtiani. Faxit Deus ut eam brevi addiſcamus: tum demum aliquam Chriſtianæ rei navabimus operam, nam nunc quidem inter eos tanquam mutæ ſtatuæ verſamur. Multa enim illi de nobis & dicunt & agitant, ad quæ nos obmuteſcimus. Patrii ipſorum ſermonis ignari, in præſentia in linguæ hujus percipiendis elementis repueraſcimus. *Xaverii, Epiſt. lib. III. epiſt. v.*

enumeration, and afterwards observes, " that " it costs much less, in such matters, to be- " lieve them at home, than to take the trou- " ble to enquire into the truth of them upon " the spot where they are said to have been " performed." *Cat. des Jesuites*, u. s. In this kind of forgery, however, the Jesuits are not alone, and they may apply to their own and other fraternities what *Horace* says of poetical romancers in general.

—*Hanc veniam petimusque, damusque vicissim.**

Shocked and disgusted, as the serious and religious protestant reader must likewise be, with this view of the abject and paganish superstition of these devotions, I willingly spare myself the trouble of raking farther at this time into the rest of the trumpery of this detestable book; such as, *the Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Mary*†—Invocation of one rank of the saints—The enumeration of these ranks —The benefit of repeating *Hail Marys*, *Paternosters*, *Angelus Domini's*, such a number of times—The manner of obtaining, and the beneficial operation of *Indulgences*, &c. &c.

* See *Reflexions upon the Devotions of the Roman church*, printed in the year 1674.

† As an inducement to this devotion, we are told, " It is not in " nature to please the one of the two hearts, without making your- " self agreeable to the other, and acceptable to both. Go then, de- " vout client, go to the heart of *Jesus*, but let your way be through " the heart of *Mary*.—The sword of grief opens you a passage, en- " ter by the wound love has made," &c. p. 73. In the litany of this devotion, " Heart of *Mary* united to that of *Jesus*.—Organ of " the Holy Ghost; Sanctuary of the Divinity; Refuge of Sinners; " Hope of the Agonizing; Seat of Mercy; Pray for us;" p. 74- " 78.——And page 80, Hail *Mary*, Spouse of the Holy Ghost; " Temple of the Divinity; Beautiful Lily of the most resplendent Trinity."

And shall only mention one more particular, as it relates to a point of popish doctrine, which their controversial writers have occasionally thought fit to disown.

It hath been objected to the papists, that let a man have been ever so notorious a sinner in the whole course of a long life, provided he does but go through with such and such forms of devotion upon his death-bed, he may insure the peace of the church, and consequently final salvation to himself. As it is evident what encouragement this must give to the most profligate sinners, the romish divines have thought fit to deny that this is the doctrine of their church. If it is not, we desire to be informed what edification the poor deluded catholics of England can reap from the following example, to be found at the 90th page of this pernicious book.

"*An Example.*

"A nobleman, who, for *sixty* years of his "life past, never had access to the sacraments, "and who had given loose to the passions of "body and mind, and abandoned himself to "the slavery of his spiritual enemy, fell sick, "and was in the utmost danger of life. Hopes "of salvation he had none; and so desperate "was his case, that he would not give ear to "the salutary advice of his director, or admit "into his mind the thoughts of reconciling "himself to his Creator, by means of the sa-"crament of Penance. Nevertheless, in the "midst of the excesses of so profligate a life, "he had never entirely lost sight of some small "devotion and regard to the ever blessed mo-"ther of God. Jesus Christ, who manifests

" the riches of his mercy, particularly to such,
" cast a favourable eye on his soul, and raised
" there so great a compunction for his sins,
" that entering into himself, and in the ut-
" most contrition of his heart, he three seve-
" ral times in the same day made a general
" confession of his whole life, received the
" holy eucharist, and the *sixth* day after, died
" in all peace and quiet of mind, and with the
" sentiments of joy which flow from a *well-*
" *grounded* confidence in the mercies and
" bounty of our suffering Redeemer and his
" sacred passion."

Hitherto the salvation of the penitent is hypothetical, depending upon the supposition that the *confidence* above mentioned was *well-grounded;* concerning which it is possible a superannuated rake, who should desire to profit by this example, might entertain some doubt. It is possible that a member even of the church of Rome, might have picked up some obscure notion of the gospel-doctrine of repentance; and if the bait was laid for a dissolute protestant, this is still more likely to happen. In either case there would be misgivings, that this peace and quiet of mind of the departing sinner might rather be the effect of an ill-grounded confidence in the priest, than of a confidence of another sort. It became necessary therefore to put the salvation of this nobleman beyond all scruple; and accordingly the fact is clinched as follows, with a witness!

" In effect, our blessed Saviour revealed,
" soon after his death, to the holy St. *Bridget*,
" that the said penitent died in a state of grace,
" was a blessed soul, and owed his happiness

" in great measure to the tender and affection-
" ate compassion which he ever found and
" nourished in his heart so often as he heard
" others speak of the *sacred Dolours* of our
" blessed lady, or happened to entertain the
" memory of them in his mind."*

No farther remarks will be necessary upon this particular passage. St. Bridget's authority for a revelation of this importance will hardly go down even with a sensible Roman catholic, who gives himself a moment's time to reflect what disorders a doctrine of this kind, backed with a divine revelation, must bring into civil society. I am willing to believe that there are particular persons among the papists, who may be convinced that, notwithstanding the decision of the council of *Constance*, *to break their faith, or to falsify their word*, whether given to heretics or others, is an immoral action, highly displeasing to God. But what security is this principle to those who deal with them, if the peace of the church may so easily be had in such circumstances as those of this nobleman? If there are particular sorts of sin out of the reach of these *Dolours* of the blessed *Mary*, there are, we are sure, other mental exercises prescribed in popery, which will do as much for the blackest sinner. We have read

* These *Dolours*, which are seven in number, have, it seems, a moveable feast assigned for the celebration of them. One would wonder what *Dolours* had to do with a *feast*, were we not told that these *seven Dolours* are overbalanced by the *twice seven Joys* of the B. Mary. The latter seven of these *Joys* were revealed, it is said, to St. *Thomas Becket*, which must be a singular recommendation to *English* catholics. See p. 76.

of absolutions being given beforehand for sins intended to be committed, where the undertakers chose not to risque their salvation on the merit of the act, without a farther security from the church. Whatever sentiments an honest and sincere papist might entertain of the lawfulness of certain actions, considered upon a comparison with the general rules of morality, it may be laid down for certain that not one of them has the least doubt concerning the efficacy of the peace of the church in securing full and final pardon for sins of the deepest dye. It may be said that the church seldom goes these lengths, but to procure some advantage to the catholic religion against her enemies. But this, I fear, will only serve to put us in mind, that the church of Rome, having a continual demand for such advantages in an heretical country, must think it necessary to dispense this peace of the church with a more liberal hand to such adventurers as may undertake, by whatever means, to promote her interest, and to improve the prospect of subduing the northern heresy.

Upon the whole, a stronger proof cannot be given than is exhibited in this book, that the fanatic spirit of popery is still the same; or if we may discern some abatement of it in popish countries, and particularly in those from which the jesuits have been expelled, we perceive, by this publication, that it is yet in its highest fermentation among the Roman catholics of this country. The intercourse which the jesuits have all along had with English papists, give those crafty fathers a sufficient insight into the demands and occasions of their

devotees, to prevent their recommending to them forms of devotion for which they have no suitable affections. What impressions are made upon our Roman catholics by these and the like means appears from their burning zeal to convert heretics, and the care they take to have their children early instructed in the same system, by putting them under the tuition of these sons and successors of St. Ignatius. And while this is their taste and temper, our catholic countrymen must excuse us, if we think these circumstances equal to a demonstration that they are still in the very dregs of the politics, as well as the superstition of the most obnoxious of their predecessors.

APPENDIX.

NUMBER II.

Containing a Letter from Pope Clement XI *to* Charles VI, *Emperor of Germany, dated* June 4, 1712.

AS it has of late been often denied that the doctrine of the council of *Constance*, viz. *That Faith is not to be kept with heretics*, and particularly when the interests of the church come in question, is the doctrine of the church of of Rome, it has been thought expedient to subjoin the decision of a Pope near 300 years after the said council was held, and that with respect to the most solemn treaties made between sovereign princes.

But, his holiness having made mention in this letter of four treaties in which the interests of the church were concerned, namely, the treaties of *Westphalia*, *Ryswick*, *Alt-Ranstadt*, and *Utrecht*, it will be necessary, that we may better understand the Pope's doctrine,

to give a short account of each of those treaties, so far as relates to the stipulations in them concerning religion.

By the peace of Westphalia, negotiated at Munster and Osnaburg in 1648, it was stipulated, that "those of the confession of Augsburg, who have been in possession of churches, and, among others, the burghers and inhabitants of Oppenheim, shall be maintained in the ecclesiastical state of the year 1624; and that others, who are desirous of embracing the same exercise of the confession of Augsburgh, shall be at liberty to practise it in public as well as in private," &c.*

It is to be observed, that the articles of this treaty have been considered as "fundamental laws and constitutions, which serve as a basis to all subsequent treaties."†

Nevertheless the Pope then reigning took care "to publish a bull, annulling all the articles of this treaty which he conceived prejudicial to the Roman catholic religion;"‡ and consequently to dispense with the Roman catholic powers, who were parties to it, from fulfilling their engagements with the protestants.

About the end of the year 1697 the peace of Ryswick was ratified. "During the negotiations at Ryswick, the ambassadors of the protestant princes delivered a memorial to the mediator, demanding that in Strasburg, and all other cities of Alsace to be ceded to France,

* Mod. Univerſal Hiſt. 8vo. vol. XXX. p. 285.
† Ibid. 284. ‡ Ibid. 291.

" the Lutheran religion should be tolerated, and " enjoy all the rights and privileges secured by " the treaty of Westphalia. The French, de- " siring some time to answer, in concert with " the imperial plenipotentiaries, neglected this " representation, and inserted in the treaty, " that the Roman catholic religion, in the " places to be delivered up, should remain in " the same state it was at that time. Thus, " no notice being taken of the protestants, se- " veral churches were left to the papists, which, " according to the laws of the empire, and the " preliminaries of the treaty, ought to have " been taken from them, and restored to the " protestants. The ministers of the electors " and other protestant princes refused to sign " the treaty till this clause was altered, and " published a memorial justifying their refusal, " and shewing that this article of the treaty " was contrary to the laws of the empire, the " peace of religion, and the treaty of West- " phalia."*

" But, as another historian observes, what " misunderstanding soever there might be be- " tween the French and imperial plenipoten- " tiaries as to other points, they agreed, or " rather combined together, to have the clause " inserted,—this affair having been secretly " concerted among the whole popish party, " who are always firm to the interests of their " religion, and zealous for them," &c.† not-

* Mod. Univ. Hift. 8vo, vol. XXX. p. 390.

† *Tindal's Continuation of Rapin*, 8vo, 1761, vol. XIV. p. 408, 409.

withstanding the intervention of the most solemn covenants, and all for the honour of Roman catholicism.

By the treaty of *Alt-Ranstadt*, 1707, it was stipulated, that "the king of Sweden [Charles "XII.] and the king elector [Augustus], as "members of the Germanic body, should act "jointly for the conservation of religion as es "tablished by the treaties of Munster and Os- "naburg [Westphalia]: that no change of re- "ligion should be admitted in Saxony or Lu- "satia; and that the Roman catholics should "be denied churches, schools, academies, col- "leges, and monasteries, within these several "districts."*

But Augustus's good fortune having restored him to the throne of Poland, all that had been covenanted at *Alt-Ranstadt* was overturned, but not without some scruples on the part both of the king and the people. Augustus had been bred in the protestant religion, where the strict obligation of oaths and covenants, and the iniquity of breaking them, is taught in agreement with the scriptures. He could not therefore be without some degree of compunction in so totally violating all the solemn engagements he had entered into at *Alt-Ranstadt*. He had learned, however, from his new religion, that *The Peace of the Church* effectually healed all breaches of this kind. "Application was there- "fore made to the court of Rome, to release "the king from the obligations contracted by

* Mod. U. H. vol. XXXIV. p. 372.

the treaty of *Alt-Ranstadt.* A few of the more "tender consciences might be hurt with seeing "him re-assume without scruple that diadem "which he had solemnly renounced, and con- "firmed by the most sacred obligations to ano- "ther. The Pontiff's absolving power would "apply remedies to be found neither in policy "nor human reason. The Nuncio granted "the absolution required, *and all good Catho- "lics were then unanimous that the oaths taken "by Augustus were of no signification.*"*

In the twenty-first article of the treaty of Utrecht, the French king stipulates with the queen of Great Britain, that "he will, in "friendship to the Queen, grant, in his treaty "with the empire, all things concerning re- "ligion to be settled according to the treaties "of Westphalia.†

* Mod. Univ. Hist. vol. XXXIV, p. 387. Among others, the Emperor Joseph had guaranteed this treaty of *Alt-Ranstadt;* but we do not read that he interposed on this occasion, or that he at all opposed the infraction of it; nor is it said how he came off with the Pope for thus deserting his engagement. We are therefore left to suppose that he reconciled this conduct to the rules of morality, by the general principle, that *no faith is to be kept with heretics.*

† *Tindal's Contin. Vol.* VI. p. 285.

"Chariſſimo in Chriſto Filio noſtro Carolo Hiſpaniarum Catholico, nec non Hungariæ & Bohemiæ Regi illuſtri, in Romanorum Imperatorum electo, CLEMENS P. P. XI.

Chariſſime in Chriſto, Fili noſter, Salutem & Apoſtolicam Benedictionem.

Plurima ſané & fervida ſtudia, quæ ab Heterodoxis Principibus adhiberi novimus in tractionibus *Ultratrajecti* inſtitutis, ut quidquid prope finem quarti articuli pacificationis *Ryſwicenſis* favore catholicorum & orthodoxæ Fidei adjectum fuit, penitus abrogetur; é con-

This we may be sure, alarmed his holiness sufficiently, and was the immediate occasion of the following address to the Emperor Charles VI.

"TO our most beloved Son in Christ, CHARLES, the Catholic King of the Spains, the illustrious King of Hungary and Bohemia, elected to be Emperor of the Romans; CLEMENT XI. Pope.

Our most dear Son in Christ, Health and apostolical Benediction.

The many and zealous endeavours which we know to be incessantly exerted by heterodox princes, in the treaties opened at Utrecht, that whatsoever was added to the fourth article of the pacification of Ryswick in favour of the catholics and the orthodox faith, should be wholly abrogated; and that on the contrary, the heads of the peace of Westphalia relating to the affair of religion, which were not only formerly condemned by this holy see, but likewise corrected by the said fourth article of Ryswick, should be reinstated, and carried into execu-

tra vero *Weſtphalicæ* pacis capita ad religionis negotium pertinentia, nedum olim ab hac ſanctâ ſede reprobata, ſed & per ipſum articulum quartum *Ryſwicenſem* correcta inſtaurentur, & executioni demandentur (qua de re, non ita pridem Majeſtati tuæ fuſe perſcripſimus), nobis in memoriam revocant infelices illas, & nunquam ſatis deplorandas pactiones, quas dudum eodem plane conſilia inferendi abominationem in loco ſancto, *Sueci* Plenipotentiarii, ſive commiſſarii non minus violenter quam injuſte expreſſerunt a Plenipotentiariis, ſeu Commiſſariis cla. mem. Joſephi, dum viveret, in Romanorum Imperatorem electi, germani fratris tui, quæque anno 1707, in Caſtris *Altranſtadenſibus*, inter eoſdem utriuſque partis commiſſarios initæ fuerunt. Summus profecto dolor quo tunc affecti fuimus, cum animo reputaremus, præter alia graviſſima catholicæ religioni ac juriſdictioni eccleſiaſticæ

tion (concerning which we lately wrote to your Majesty at large), recall to our memory those unhappy, and never enough to be lamented covenants, which, plainly, with the same design of bringing the abomination into the holy place, the plenipotentiaries or commissaries of Sweden no less violently than unjustly extorted from the Plenipotentiaries or Commissaries of your brother, the late Emperor Joseph of famous memory, and which were entered into by the said Commissaries on each part in the year 1707, in the camp at Alt Ranstadt. The great grief with which we were then affected, when we considered with ourselves, that, besides other most grievous detriments brought upon the catholic religion and the ec-

per eas pactiones illata detrimenta, insignem adeo ecclesiarum numerum tum in tribus ducatibus *Lignienſi*, *Bergenſi*, ac *Munſterbergenſi*, tum in ipsa *Uratiſlavienſi* civitate, ac in reliquis etiam *Sileſiæ* principatibus, vero Dei cultui eripi & auferri, ac execrandæ sectæ impiætati tradi & assignari, nunc maxime non tantum renovatur, sed majorem etiam in modum intenditur ac augetur, dum cogitatione complectimur, atque prospicimus quantam inde spem sumpturi sint Acatholici, reliquas etiam eorum nefarias machinationes atque consilia perficiendi. Porro, etsi compertum habeamus Majestatem tuam minime latere, quam alieno a memoratis pactionibus animo idem frater tuus fuerit; quantopere doluerit, quod ob res suas tunc in arcto positas, ejusmodi duras, ac plane impias conditiones accipere coactus fuerit; & quo tandem æstuaverit desideria congruis remediis, quæ perperam acta fuerant sarciendi ac raparandi; quæ omnia ipse literis sua manu exaratis diserte nobis significavit, & luculentius etiam ac uberius dilecto filio nostro *Annibali*, sanctæ romanæ ecclesiæ cardinali *Albano*, nostro secundem carnem ex fratre nepoti, per idem tempus apud eum agenti non semel explicavit: et quamvis itidem ambigere nequaquam possumus, quin majestas tua pro eximia pietate ac studio quo intensa est causæ Dei veræque religionis, probe intelligat & agnoscat ejusmodi pactiones prorsus inanes, & suapte natura irritas ac nullius roboris vel momenti extitisse & existere, quemadmodum eas germanus frater tuus, a nobis admonitus, palam agnovit & professus est; & propterea optime etiam perspiciat nullam prorsus earum habendam esse rationem, nec illas a

clesiastical jurisdictions, by those covenants, so remarkable a number of churches, as well in the three duchies of *Lignitz*, *Berg*, and *Munsterberg*, as in the city of *Wratislaw*, and in the other principalities of *Silesia*, should be torn off and taken away from the true worship of God, and delivered up and assigned to the impiety of an execrable sect, is now chiefly not only renewed, but in a greater measure augmented, and become more intense, while we reflect and foresee how great hope the heretics will derive from thence of perfecting the rest of their wicked machinations and counsels.

quoquam alligari aut observari ullo modo posse, nec debere: nihilominus, tum ut quæ semper fuerit, & adhuc sit nostra ea de re sententia, majestati tuæ clarius & apertius innotescat, tum etiam ut apostolico nostro judicio inrixa, solidius & alacrius prædictas conventiones prorsus contemnere, ac ita illas habere possit, tanquam si nunquam factæ fuissent; majestati tuæ per præsentes denunciamus, ac insimul, tradita nobis ab omnipotenti Deo authoritate, declaramus prænarratas dicti tractatus *Altranstadensis* pactiones cæteraque in ea contenta, quæ catholicæ fidei, divino cultui, animarum saluti, ecclesiæque authoritati, jurisdictioni, libertati ac juribus quibuscunque quomodolibet officiunt, sive præjudicium etiam minimum afferunt, aut inferre seu intulisse vel alias nocere seu nocuisse quoquomodo dici, censeri, prætendi vel intelligi possent, cum omnibus & singulis inde secutis & quandocunque secuturis, ipso jure nulla irrita, invalida, injusta, reprobata, inania, viribusque & effectu penitus & omnino vacua ab ipso initio fuisse & esse ac perpetuo fore, neminemque ad illorum seu cujusvis illorum, etiamsi pluries ratificata ac juramento vallata sint, observantiam teneri, imo nec illa ullatenus a quoquam observari potuisse ac debuisse aut posse & debere, neque ex illis cuiquam aliquod jus vel actionem vel titulum etiam coloratum vel possidendi ac prescribendi causam acquisitam vel acquisitam fuisse, nec esse minusque ullo tempore acquiri & competere posse, neque illa ullum statum facere vel fecisse, sed perinde ac si nunquam emanassent nec facta fuissent, pro non extantibus & non factis perpetuo haberi debere. Et nihilominus ad uberiorem cautelam & quatenus opus sit, pactiones prædictas aliaque præmissa, ut præfertur præjudicialia harum serie, improbamus, rescindimus, cassamus, irritamus, & annullamus, viribusque & effectu penitus & omnino vacuamus. Age igitur, charissime in Christo fili noster, ac pactionibus hujusmodi penitus rejectis,

Moreover, although we are certain that it is no secret to your Majesty how averse your said brother was to the covenants above-mentioned; how greatly he grieved that, because of the difficulties in which his affairs were involved, he was obliged to accept of those hard and plainly impious conditions, and how earnestly he desired to repair and make good by proper remedies whatsoever had been corruptly transacted, all of which he expressly signified to us by letters written with his own hand, and still more amply and clearly explained more than once to our beloved son *Annibal* Cardinal of *Albano*, of the holy roman church, our nephew, by the father's side, according to the flesh, then residing with him as our agent; and although we can by no means doubt but that your Majesty, from your eminent piety, and the affection you bear to the cause of God and the church, perfectly understands and acknowledges that such covenants have been and are wholly void, and in their own nature, of no force or effect, as your brother, being admonished by us, openly acknowledged and

iisque omnibus quæ in earum executionem quovis modo gesta fuerunt rescissis, ecclesiæ, religionis, ac Dei causam fortiter tuere, & ab ejus patrocinio suscepti tui regiminis felicia auspicare primordia. Ostende satis tibi persuasum esse præcipuas tuas partes, pro eâ quam obtines Imperii Majestate, non alias esse debere quam in propugnandis Fidei & Ecclesiæ Juribus, religiosissimi inclytique Imperatores majores tui afferere semper atque amplificare pro viribus studuerunt. Ita plane perennem tuo nomini laudem & gloriam, cælestesque tibi augustæque tuæ domui benedictiones magis magisque conciliabis; quarum in auspicium, cum perpetuo felicitatis tuæ voto conjunctam, Apostolicam Benedictionem Majestati tuæ amantissimè impertimur. Datum *Romæ* apud Sanctum *Petrum*, sub annulo piscatoris, die 4to *Junii* 1712, Pontificatus nostri anno duodecimo."

professed, and, on that account, also fully perceives that no regard ought to be paid to them, and that they neither can nor ought to be alledged or observed by any person or in any manner whatsoever; yet, as well that it may more plainly and openly appear to your Majesty, what always has been and still is our judgement in that matter, as that your Majesty, being more substantially supported by our apostolical decision, may with more alacrity utterly despise the before-mentioned conventions, and esteem them as if they had never been made; WE, by these presents, denounce to your Majesty, and at the same time, by the authority committed to us by the most omnipotent God, declare the before-mentioned covenants of the treaty of *Alt-Ranstadt*, and every thing contained in it which are in any wise obstructive of, or hurtful to, or which may be said, esteemed, pretended, or understood, to occasion or to bring, or to have brought the least prejudice to, or any ways to hurt, or to have hurt the catholic faith, divine worship, the salvation of souls, the authority, jurisdiction, or any rights of the church whatsoever, together with all and singular matters which have followed, or may at any time hereafter follow from them, to be, and to have been, and perpetually to remain hereafter, *de jure* null, vain, invalid, unjust, reprobated, void, and evacuated of all force and effect from the beginning, and that no person is bound to the observation of them, or any of them, although the same have been repeatedly ratified or secured by an oath; and that they neither could nor ought to have been, nor can or ought to be;

observed by any person whatsoever; and that no right, action, title, colour of title, cause of possession or prescription, is or hath been acquired from them, much less may be acquired or accrue by any length of time; and that they create or have created no estate or quality, but that they ought for ever to be accounted as if they had never issued, and as if they were not extant, nor had ever been made. And nevertheless, for the greater caution, and so far as may be necessary, we disapprove, rescind, cassate, make void, annull, and totally discharge of all force and effect, all the aforesaid covenants, and all other the premises enumerated in these presents which are prejudicial as aforesaid. Wherefore, our most dear son in Christ, attend, and wholly rejecting all covenants of this kind, and rescinding every thing which has in any manner been done towards the execution of them, valiantly defend the cause of the church, of religion, and of God; and from that patronage take the omen of an happy beginning of the government you have undertaken. Make it appear that you are thoroughly persuaded that the chief part you have to act, agreeably to the majesty of the empire to which you are elevated, consists in strenuously maintaining the rights of the faith and of the church, which the most religious and renowned emperors your ancestors studied to assert and amplify with all their might. So will you derive upon your name everlasting praise and glory, and secure to yourself and your august house the blessings of heaven more and more, as an earnest of which we most lovingly impart to your Majesty our apos-

tolical benediction, accompanied with a perpetual prayer for your felicity. Given at St. Peter's in Rome, under the ring of the fisherman, the 4th day of June, 1712, and in the twelfth year of our pontificate.*"

REMARKS.

1. It appears by this letter, that, from the time of the council of Constance to the year 1712, it was the constant and invariable doctrine of the church of Rome, that all stipulations with protestants concerning church-matters, that is to say, which granted any religious advantages to the protestants, or withdrew any from the papists, were to be considered by the good catholics as *ipso jure* null and invalid from the beginning.

2. If the Pope does not belye the Emperor Joseph, his Imperial Majesty was exactly of the same sentiments with his holiness concerning the treaty of *Alt-Ranstadt*. He looked upon those articles of it, which gave so many churches to the protestants, as of no validity; but the necessity of his affairs requiring his present compliance, he could only lament his hard fate to the Cardinal Annibal, and express his desire of finding proper remedies to patch up the breaches thus made in the jurisdiction of holy church. When Augustus re-assumed the Polish sceptre, the Emperor's sorrows were assuaged of course. Whether he found the same spiritual remedy which was applied to the

* Transcribed from the Appendix to Sydney on Government, Edit. 1763, Quarto, printed for Millar, p. 70.

conscience of Augustus, or no, for deserting his guaranty, and for infringing so much of the treaty as more immediately belonged to himself, his holiness does not mention. His contrition, however, we may suppose, intitled him to the peace of the church of course, and so far, we may conclude, he died in the *odour of sanctity.*

3. Charles VI, his successor, by not acceding to the treaty of Utretcht, avoided the temptation of incurring the sad effects of his holiness's denunciation. By what had passed at Utretcht, Lewis XIV *only* was bound to see that the treaty of Westphalia should be confirmed in his treaty with the empire. At the treaty of Radstadt in 1714, Lewis had an opportunity of performing what his friendship for the queen of Great Britain had induced him to promise at Utretcht. But in the accounts I have seen of that pacification, there is no mention made of the treaty of Westphalia. And as the Emperor stipulated at Radstadt that the king of France should execute the treaty of Ryswick,* it is likely that his most christian Majesty's zeal for the church took the lead, on that occasion, of his complaisance for the queen of Great Britain. And indeed, if what another historian relates is true, the remonstrances of her Majesty's minister at the Hague concerning the fourth article of the treaty of Ryswick, which should have been modified at Radstadt, by substituting the stipulations of Westphalia, had no manner of regard paid to them.†

* Mod. Univ. Hist. vol XXV. p. 213.

† Tindal's Contin. vol. VI. p. 141, 142.

The roman catholics will now be pleased to inform us, at what period, since 1714, the roman pontiff, or the states of Europe in communion with him, have either disowned the doctrines and maxims above-mentioned, or corrected their practice by others of a more creditable family. If this cannot be shewn, we shall hardly believe that the good faith of the individuals of that communion, where the interests of their church come in question, is secured to the protestants upon any better grounds than a temporary dispensation, which will last no longer than the church remains in a state of inability to assert her authority, and reclaim her omnipotence.

APPENDIX.

NUMBER III.

Copy of a Letter from an English *Gentleman on his travels, to a friend of his in* London, *dated* Paris, March 21, 1766. *From the* St. James's Chronicle, May 13, 1766.

Dear Sir,

IN compliance with your request, I have made it my business, to enquire into the present state of the popish seminaries for the education of English and Irish children in Flanders, and along the coast from Boulogne.

I have also endeavoured to discover, what are and have been the views and designs of the popish jacobite party of Scotch, English, and Irish, the avowed enemies to our present happy constitution.

And I have collated every memoir, concerning the character, conduct and situation of the young pretender since he left Avignon, that appeared to me to be well founded.

At Boulogne, which is an ancient, disagreeable town, situated partly on an eminence, and partly in a bottom, close to the sea, there is a French convent, very famous for the education of young ladies from England. At pre-

sent they have about thirty English girls, from about eight years of age to fifteen.

There is likewise an English convent there. They have twenty, nearly of the same age.

At Calais, which is only seven leagues distant from Boulogne, there is a French convent, which has no less than seven and forty boarders, girls; all of them the children of protestant parents about Dover, Canterbury, and other parts of Kent; and some of their parents are actually in the g——— service, such as masters of ———, &c.

At Graveline, four leagues from Calais, there is another English convent or nunnery, where they have twenty girls or more.

At Dunkirk, not four leagues from Calais, are two more nunneries; in each of which there are above thirty English girls.

At Bruges, twelve leagues from Dunkirk, there are two English convents, one of which has, at this time, near forty girls, and the other twenty-three.

At Ghent, eight leagues from Bruges, there is an English convent for girls. They have only fourteen.

At Brussels, ten leagues from Ghent, there are two English convents. One of them has sixteen girls, and the other about eighteen.

At Louvain, four leagues from Brussels, there is an English convent, which has near forty girls, chiefly Irish.

At Lear, a small town between Ghent and Antwerp, there is an English convent, where, I am informed, they have about thirty girls.

This is the state of the seminaries for girls in that country.

The general prices for board and education are, from twelve to twenty pounds sterling a year. In some, music is paid for a-part; in others, that and dancing are included.

It should be observed, that they will not grant the protestant children, on any consideration, the least indulgence with respect to their own religion; nor will they dispense with any other than the most strict conformity in them, to the observance of all the rites and ceremonies of the Roman catholic religion. Thus—if they have any protestant books of devotion, they must lock them up, and peruse them in private; but in most convents they will not suffer the children to keep them. They must observe all fasts and vigils as strictly as the nuns themselves; must attend at mass on all festivals or days of obligation to hear mass.—The gardens and passages, from one part of these convents to another, are filled with images of the virgin and their saints; and the passing those images without a courtesy is a forfeit of a farthing or a halfpenny. The forfeits, for the first six months, draw a good deal of money out of the pockets of the parents of protestant girls.

These girls are early and carefully grounded in a partial history of England; and taught to believe, that the true king of England is in exile at Rome.

When it is considered, how few parents in England give their children the least idea of history; the designing artful view of giving

them a false notion of it here, appears in a horrid light; and when it is considered, that these girls are to be wives to protestant husbands, and mothers too of protestant children; it seems more detrimental to have them educated in this manner than most men would imagine: and, that they acquire not only an inclination, but even a fondness for the ceremonies of the romish church, and an early attachment to the unfortunate house of Stuart, as they call it, is indubitable. I do not depend upon information; *I have seen* repeated instances of childrens attachment to each; and that so, as to oppose the religion and government of their native country, with rancour and fury, at fourteen years of age.

I must now return to the neighbourhood of Calais, where the first considerable seminary for boys is to be found.

At St. Omer's, there is a stately building (college,) which belonged to the English jesuits, before the jesuits were expelled from France, and its dominions. On their expulsion, a party of secular priests from Douay obtained leave to settle in that college: these priests are partly Irish, but the majority of them English: they have under their care about fifty boys; and they have rendered a school at Boulogne, kept likewise by secular priests, of little or no note.

Their brethren at Douay, have near a hundred and fifty boys at their college.

Besides these, there is no seminary of account in the country, till you get to Bruges; where the English jesuits, with some few Irish,

that were driven from St. Omer's, are more advantageously established than ever.

They have formed themselves into two colleges or societies, aiding and assisting to each other, by the names of the minor school, and the college. They occupy, at present, two very large mansion houses, formerly belonging to noble families in Bruges; but they have purchased ground, and are preparing to erect very stately, expensive buildings; for which purpose, they send emissaries to England, from time to time, to collect contributions. They have one hundred and seventy-five youths in their college, *all of them cloathed in the jesuit's habit*, their ages from ten to twenty-two years. The minor school has about eighty boys, from five to nine years of age. Between nine and ten they are sent to the upper school or college. In the parlours, at both schools, where the masters speak to strangers, there are whole and three-quarter-length pictures of the young pretender, in regal robes, and in military dresses, with the ensigns of the order of the garter. Every pamphlet published in 1764, and 1765, tending to promote the principles of despotism, to extend the prerogative of the crown, &c. found its way to Bruges, where quantities were distributed in the college; and many of the indecent songs and prints, which glanced at the most respectable and first personages in the nation, were, at the same time, given to little boys in the minor school: these, and the older boys in the college, are all obliged, strictly, to observe all the rites and ceremonies of the romish church.

In the minor school, they board and educate for twenty pounds a year: in the college, for twenty-five, and include the habit. In the minor school they do not wear it, and the parents find cloaths; so that this is much dearer than many schools about London: the parents of protestant children, therefore, have no excuse on the account of cheapness. And as to saying they do not meddle with their religion, which is the plausible bait to obtain protestant children, I could give a striking instance to the contrary, which happened to fall within my own observation.

The situation of these jesuits at Bruges is peculiarly unhappy for England; as the parents of the children who are educated there, instead of making excursions into the country in summer, go from London in the trading vessels, which are continually frequenting the Flemish coast, spend their time and money at Bruges, and return home, the greater number of them, loaden with lace, &c. to smuggle, to pay their passage and expences.

At Louvain, the Irish and English share the university; the Irish, in particular, have very large and extensive colleges: there they educate priests and physicians to export to Ireland, but no protestant boys are there.*

* In the *London Chronicle*, *October* 17, 1767, a writer, under the name of *Verax*, hath thought fit to contradict this account of our Engliſh traveller; but hath done this, however, in a manner that ſeems rather to confirm it. He ſays, *no engliſh convent exiſts at Boulogne, but in our traveller's imagination.* But will he ſay, there is no hotel at Boulogne, where engliſh girls are educated? If there is, of what conſequence is it whether ſuch a houſe is called an engliſh convent or not? Let us, however, attend to the ingenious and entertaining Dr. Smollet, "Here [at Boulogne] is a ſquare,

It is certain, that the whole disaffected party on this side the water were more parti-

" a town-houſe, and two or three convents of nuns, in one of which " there are ſeveral engliſh girls, ſent hither for their education." [*Travels, vol. I.* p. 29] This is pretty near the mark. If this may not be called an engliſh convent, it is at leaſt a convent diſtinguiſhed from two other French ones, by the circumſtance of receiving engliſh girls for education. If the engliſh ſecular ſchool for boys, heretofore at Boulogne, is broke up, the travelling gentleman hath very well accounted for it. *Verax* ſays, and he ſays truly, that, *engliſh papiſts are more excuſeable in ſending their children abroad for education, than engliſh proteſtants.* But it is not equally true that *engliſh papiſts have not opportunities of having their children educated in their own tenets here at home.* That the papiſts of this country want inſtruction for their children in the tenets of their own religion, no one can believe, who hath taken any notice of the number of their prieſts, and how conveniently they are ſtationed for the edification of their flocks. And if any other accompliſhments are wanted, it is ſaid, and, I believe, upon good authority, that the roman catholic youth may reſort to ſeminaries, where there is no danger that their religious or political principles ſhould be diſturbed. Some time ago, as I have been informed, an academy was opened not far from the metropolis, under the direction of a French roman catholic, for the accompliſhment of young gentlemen in modern languages, mathematical learning, and polite and manly exerciſes. The teachers indeed were ſaid to be proteſtants; but the profeſſed plan abovementioned of the academy is by no means unfavourable to the ſuppoſition that even the ſons of roman catholics might learn what was there to be taught, without running any riſk of being unſettled in their faith. How it is, or has been, in ſome other parts of the kingdom, may be underſtood from two remarkable letters which I ſhall give at the end of this note, written by a nameſake of this critic upon our traveller. On another hand, it is well known that there is at York a large building called by the name of the Nunnery, which is underſtood to be a place of education for young ladies of the roman catholic perſuaſion, and which has had that reputation for many years. Nor is it to be doubted but there are other places in the kingdom where popiſh girls are entertained for the ſame purpoſe. But to return to *Verax*. He is extremely pleaſant upon the notion of an Univerſity at Louvain, imagining, as it ſhould ſeem, that the denomination of an univerſity is not taken from its inſtitution and privileges, but from the numbers that reſort to it for education. Can a man who is ignorant that Louvain has been a famous univerſity

cularly active in sending over their emissaries in the springs and summers of 1764, and 1765.

for so many generations, be depended upon for a just account of the number or quality of the pupils educated in it? At length, by dropping one concession after another, he comes up to every thing advanced by our traveller, who only says, that at Louvain, "the Irish have very large and extensive colleges," without mentioning with what numbers they are replenished. As several writers in the newspapers have, at different times, been nibbling at this most seasonable letter of our worthy traveller, it may not be amiss, to confirm his report by testimonies which will admit of no dispute. Dr. Smollet, having spoken as above, of the convents at Boulogne, goes on thus: "the smallness of the expence encourages parents to send their "children abroad to these seminaries, where they learn scarce any "thing that is useful but the French language: but they never fail "to imbibe prejudices against the protestant religion, and generally "turn enthusiastic converts to the religion of Rome. This conver-"sion always generates a contempt for, and often an aversion to, "their own country. Indeed it cannot reasonably be expected that "people of weak minds, addicted to superstition, should either love "or esteem those whom they are taught to consider as reprobated he-"reties. Ten pounds a year is the usual pension in these convents; "but I have been informed by a French lady, who had her educa-"tion in one of them, that nothing can be more wretched than their "entertainment," p. 30. Let us hear another writer, who seems to give an account of a convent on the French coast, which is not in our traveller's list. "Ardres is most delightfully situated.——At "the Benedictine convent there I placed my daughter, which is in "all respects better than either of the convents at Calais, were it not "cheaper. The principal nun speaks english very well, and is a "sensible, well-behaved woman. I conversed with several english "young ladies under her protection, who all seemed happy and con-"tented. Those parents, however, who would be terrified at the "thoughts of a child's conversion to the catholic religion, ought not "to send them to any convent for education in France. For though "they do not attempt to convert the children by any direct means, "there are many indirect methods; and the ceremony of high mass "must naturally have much influence upon young minds. Add to "this, they are obliged to attend divine service constantly, and they "are continually hearing the bigoted part of the convent lamenting "that so fine a girl, so sensible a girl, (or the like), should not be in "the only safe road to heaven; while perhaps the catholic girls of "the same age throw out an insinuation to the protestant misses, that,

It is almost incredible what numbers of priests, in disguise, went over at those periods from

" if they were to die in the convent, they would not be buried, but " thrown into the town ditch, and be eaten by the dogs." *Mr. Thicknesse's Observations on the customs and manners of the French nation*, chap. iii. Having not the book by me, I transcribe this from the Critical Review; and I suppose it to be sufficiently exact: my purpose being only to cite this writer to a matter of fact, which he had no temptation to misrepresent, and wherein he is in full agreement with our excellent traveller. It were indeed to be wished that the religion of this gentleman had not sat so loosely upon him, as it appears to have done by what follows. " My daughter, who is " now fifteen years of age, with, I hope, a very tolerable capacity, " and who had been six months in the Benedictine convent at Cala- " is" [should it not be Ardres?] " asked me upon the road, whe- " ther if I settled in France, I would change my religion? I con- " cealed my surprise at this question, and replied, I was very doubt- " ful whether I could do that or not; and then, in my turn, I asked " her, whether she had any thoughts of changing hers? I like the " religion very well, she replied, and so does every english lady in " our convent, who would all change if they durst. I should not " have said thus much on the subject of religion, but that you seemed " inclined to have sent your daughter over, and therefore I thought " myself bound to say no less, and leave you to be guided by your " own good judgement; assuring you, at the same time, that I am " under no great concern about the fate of my own children, having " experienced too much persecution in my own person, and in my " own country, to be solicitous to breed up my children (in a coun- " try where they must now in all probability live and die) to be " subject to persecutions on that score." So much for the solicitude of the father, and the tolerable capacity of the daughter. However, the more detached this gentleman was from concern about his own or his children's religion, the more unbiassed witness he is of the particulars for which he is cited. For the traffick of conveying children from the British to the Flemish coast, and the occasions taken by priests of making use of that conveyance, we have the testimony of an eye-witness, in the following extract from a late address to the most reverend and right reverend the archbishops and bishops of the church of England, p. 8, 9, 10. " It chanced that I visited the " Austrian Netherlands a few years ago, and, amongst other places " of note, my curiosity carried me to Ghent, where I met with " numbers of priests of all denominations, who told me they had been " several times in England, and purposed going thither again

Calais, Dunkirk, and Ostend. Most of the titular bishops passed over; in particular, the

" Amongſt the reſt, I converſed with two jeſuits on board the fa-
" mous veſſel which is employed in conveying paſſengers to Bruſſels,
" and from thence to Ghent. Upon my taking the liberty to aſk
" them, which way they were going? they told me very frankly,
" they were ſteering for England. And I pray, friends, to what
" purpoſe (I replied) when you acknowledge you cannot ſpeak the
" language of the country? Our good brethren (they anſwered)
" will ſoon inſtruct us in that. I alſo found an engliſh woman on
" board the ſame veſſel, who owned ingenuouſly to me, that her
" principal employment was to convey young children from England
" to Bruges for their education, and to fetch them back again to
" their parents when that was completed. I do not recollect what
" number of children ſhe had with her at that time, nor is it of much
" conſequence; but what ſtruck me the moſt, was the nature of her
" occupation, and the facility with which ſhe imparted it to her
" countryman." After this, the number of engliſh proteſtant children, mentioned by our traveller to be in the French and Flemiſh convents, will hardly ſeem incredible, when here is a perſon who gets her maintenance by tranſporting them backwards and forwards. If any one is deſirous of ſeeing more of the bad conſequences of this kind of education, I would recommend the peruſal of an admirable letter in the *St. James's Chronicle*, *January* 21, 1768, ſigned ANTIGALLICA. That the papiſts have no occaſion to complain of the want of ſeminaries in this country for the education of their children in their own way, the two following letters ſeem to prove pretty plainly.

To the Printer of the LONDON CHRONICLE.

" SIR, *Birmingham, Jan.* 30.

" You will permit me, by your uſeful paper, to inform the pub-
" of the following intereſting particulars. Many complaints having
" lately been made of the growth of popery among us, and of the
" arts of its prieſts in making proſelytes, I have lately had an op-
" portunity of diſcovering a practice introduced amongſt us under
" their patronage, which is and muſt be in its conſequences deſtruc-
" tive to the trade of this kingdom, in the preſervation of which we
" are all concerned. In the pariſh of Sedgeley, between Dudley
" and Wolverhampton, is a large houſe employed as a ſchool, in
" which are boarded and educated more than one hundred boys, many

bishop of London, who was treated by the english, on this side the water, with peculiar respect. It was remarked to them, that it was to be feared such a number of jesuits had retired to England, that offence would be taken at it. The answer was, their friends and patrons were too wise to molest them; that they had carried money with them, and placed it in the english funds; and that the T—— of E——

" of whom are foreigners; who are put out as apprentices to various " branches of trade [in] which that country is known to excel, es- " pecially in the manufacture of iron and brass. Now, Sir, as " this can only be done to enable them to employ that skill which " they acquire among us for the benefit of their own country, it " becomes highly necessary, in my opinion, this evil should be in- " quired into and prevented; it being equally as pernicious in its " consequences, and more lasting in its effects, than the seduction " of our workmen by strangers, which we have always attempted to " hinder by the most severe penalty. Are not such men enemies to " the nation in its civil capacity? Should they not be restrained, " lest the evil should be past remedy? Permit me to mention one " thing more which has fallen under my notice. A protestant with " whom I am acquainted was strongly solicited to send his son to this " school, and it is to be feared many may be unwarily drawn into " it on a promise of having their education gratis. However, " it is well known that the papists, who are numerous, are supplied " with apprentices from this seminary, many of whom are the chil- " dren of protestants educated at this place, with what view, but " for the promotion and increase of the catholic religion? If " what I have related is fact, then it is incumbent on those who have " power and authority, to remedy the evil complained of. This " they will do, if they regard the present or future interest of church " or state. I am, Sir, your's, &c.

" VERAX."

" P. S. Large additions being now making to Sedgeley park, " it is reported they are intended as a school for girls." *London Chronicle, February* 4, 1766. p. 117.

This letter having raised the curiosity of another of the Printer's correspondents, a more particular account of these matters was requested, under the signature of *Defensor*. To which the following answer was inserted in the *London Chronicle of April* 15, 1766, p. 355.

wanted recruiting too much, for them to regard through whose hands property was brought into the nation.

Much about the same periods, vast quantities of popish books, prints, pictures, and other such holy lumber, were sent over; together

" *To the Printer of the London Chronicle.*

" SIR,

" In compliance with *Defenſor's* requeſt ſome time ago in your " paper, pleaſe to inſert the following particulars.—In the pariſh " of *Egebaſton*, adjoining to this town, is now, and has been for " many years, a popiſh ſchool of great eminence; in this pariſh " many converts have been made to popery, particularly a friend of " mine, who, in the abundance of his zeal for the propagation of " his new religion, willingly ſent his ſon abroad, to be educated for " the church. In the pariſh of *Salihall*, ſix miles from hence, the " number of papiſts is amazingly increaſed; they have lately erected " a building for their religious worſhip, which has the appearance of " a gentleman's houſe. At *Badſly Clinton*, five miles further, " they are numerous; at *Grove Park*, four miles, you have them " again; from hence to *Wotten Wowen*, near *Henly*, four miles, " they are in great numbers; four miles beyond is *Caughton*, near " *Alceſter*, where many converts have been added to them, ſome " of whom I know. In this place more people reſort to their place " of worſhip, than to the pariſh church. At *Stitkts*, at *Peely*, " eight miles from hence, where there is another large ſchool, or was " lately, they abound, though their exact numbers cannot by me be " aſcertained; yet I am fully perſuaded, could they be known, the " amount would be found very large."————I omit the remaining part of this letter, ſigned likewiſe VERAX, as deſcending to particulars not neceſſary to be mentioned, and thus far is ſufficient to ſhew the miſtake of the other *Verax* of *October* 17, 1767, with reſpect to the opportunities engliſh roman catholics have of educating their children in their own tenets at home, and ſhall only farther obſerve that we have ſubjoined to this letter the following Poſtſcript. " P. S. As I know all the places mentioned " above, I am certain of the truth of my aſſertions concerning them." See the apprehenſions of *Verax* in the former of theſe letters too well confirmed, in the *Public Advertiſer*, Wedneſday, *January* 27, 1768.

with several complete sets of French prints of the house, called of Stuart.

Since the change of the administration, they seem quite dejected; and since the bustle that has been made in London about private mass-houses, the priests have come back, like herrings, in shoals. I hope, by this circumstance among others, that the present administration are the trusty, right characters we have always imagined them to be.

If they did but know what a spirit of intolerance, of oppression, and of the rankest bigotry and enthusiasm reigns throughout the queen of Hungary's dominions in Flanders, surely they would make use of reprisals. No protestant can obtain a settlement in that country; nor even baptize, much more educate a child in his own way. We humbled France, we humbled Spain, might have for ever! But we left unpunished that ungrateful bigot, whose deputies in Flanders will hardly suffer an englishman to breathe; and who have oppressed the British commerce to such a degree, that it must be totally lost in a short time. Yet we conquered this country for her.

It is to be hoped that some method will be taken at home, to prevent all persons going into, and out of the kingdom, as they please, without the least notice or examination; otherwise popery must flourish in England.

The popish party have depended much on the unsettled, roving disposition of the people of England, both with respect to their political and religious tenets. They boast much of the increase of the methodists, and talk of that sect with rapture; while they enlarge on the

negligence and profligate manners of the clergy of the church of England. How far the methodists and papists stand connected in principles I know not; but I believe it is beyond a doubt, that they are in constant correspondence with each other.*

* I would willingly hope, some doubt may be made of this. There is indeed one remarkable incident, which might reasonably enough create a suspicion of this sort, namely, the late publication of the life of Francis Xavier, the famous jesuit missionary to the Indies, abridged from father Bohours, a member of the same order. The Monthly Reviewers for May 1765, inform us, that this abridgement is the work of Mr. James Morgan, one of Mr. Wesley's preachers. It is a pity this abridger should not have been apprized from what kind of vouchers Bohours compiled his life of Xavier, and what strong imputations of forgery fell upon *Turfellin*, *Ribadeneira*, and *Alegambe*, from whom *Bohours* had his materials, even from the learned and more freethinking papists themselves. Xavier was one of the first associates of Loyola, and whether Xavier was the dupe of his master's politics, or a conscious accomplice, is by no means a clear case. Lay the books of *Turfellin*, *Ribadeniera*, *Alegambe*, and *Bohours* (which contain a heap of palpable fictions from end to end), out of the question, and very little is known how Xavier passed his time in the Indies; but from the letters ascribed to him, in which some of his accounts are very consistent with the designs of a man by no means mortified to all secular considerations. *Stephen Pasquier*, a very learned and staunch romanist, seems to have thought Xavier as deep in what he calls the *piperies* of the jesuits, as any of the fraternity; if so, he was a knave and a hypocrite. Suppose him sincere, and he was at the best a crack-brained enthusiast, and in neither case a proper example for pious and rational protestants. And therefore it were to be wished, for the credit of Mr. Wesley and his followers, who would be understood to espouse the principles of our first reformers, that they would publicly disavow this superstitious publication, and every other (if such others there are among them) of the same tendency. In the mean time, it ought to be mentioned to Mr. Whitefield's praise, that he took timely care to preclude all suspicions of his having any connexions with popery, by his account of some remarkable Ecclesiastical Entertainments, as he calls them in his letters from Lisbon, published in the year 1755, in which are many sensible and pertinent observations, well worth the notice of all protestants.

The young pretender, by the best informations I could procure, which, indeed, vary, and are difficult to be relied on, retired to Avignon, after his disgrace of being arrested in this city, and stayed there a few months. He then went to Liege, where he lived some time in a very private manner, and took the title of *Baron de Montgomerie.* How long he lived thus, or what private excursions he made into other countries, I know not: but about the year 1757, he settled at *Bouillon,* where he continued to the time of his departure for Rome, on account of the death of his father.

He was privately visited by several persons from England, in the summers 1764, 1765.

His person is tall, and rather lusty; his complexion has a redness in it not unlike the effects of drinking: he has a complaint in his legs, which obliges him to wear a kind of half-boots.

It has generally been reported, that he was totally imbecile; that he gives himself up to drinking; and that he has a secret tendency to the protestant religion; all which circumstances are notoriously false.

He is pusillanimous to an incredible degree; and it is now well known here too, as in Scotland and England, that even at the battle of Culloden he withdrew, before the rebel army was broken: but as to his love of drinking, or any acts which denote him to be turned foolish; these reports owe their origin to some frantick tricks he played on his mistress leaving him, and either really, or as he imagined, secreting herself in a convent at Bouillon. It is certain,

that he fired a pistol toward the convent, a ball from which passed through one of the windows of it, and wounded a nun in the shoulder. At that time he likewise addicted himself to drinking, in the first heats of his fury for the elopement of that mistress, a French lady of distinction: but this incident happened several years ago; and he has lately always appeared calm and composed, talked very rationally, and read much, and been fond of music.

As to his religion, there is not a greater bigot upon earth: he has his bottle for holy water at his bed's head; he never mounts his horse, or goes out on a shooting party, but he crosses himself many times; and is strongly attached to the grossest fooleries of the romish religion.*

Many of his friends declare, that he was so exasperated by his arrest and the breaking open his house here, from whence a letter was said to be carried off, written by the French king, promising him perpetual protection, and a princely revenue, that he never will enter into any measures proposed to him by that monarch.

By the accounts just arrived here from Rome, I have learnt the further following particulars concerning him and his family.

On the death of the old gentleman, the cardinal, his son, wrote a letter to the pope, to acquaint him with that event; and to request his protection for his brother. This letter was accompanied by a memorial. A congregation

* See Dr. Sharpe's Letters from Italy.

of cardinals was convened to deliberate on those matters. A public funeral was resolved on, and much superfluous pageantry appeared in it; yet no cannons were permitted to be drawn in the procession, nor to be fired on the occasion. As soon as the body was removed from the palace of the *Santi Apostoli* [the pretender's palace,] the sentry-boxes were taken away, and the guard-room shut up, by order of the secretary of state; and not long after, the arms of England were taken down from it, by a second order.

In regard to the question, whether the title of the father should be given to the son, it was resolved in the negative.

Things being in this situation, it was imagined the son would not proceed to *Rome*; and *Urbino* was proposed, and approved of by the cardinal his brother, as a place of residence for him; and an express dispatched to meet him in his route, and apprize him of these circumstances. That person met him a few posts on this side Florence; yet on he went, under the title of *Count Douglass*, and arrived at Rome very unexpectedly.

His immediate declaration there was, that he would receive none but those who should give him his father's title. On the first days after his arrival, a few persons of different ranks visited him; which being known, a severe reprimand was sent them, and express orders issued, that no person should presume to give him that title. He then resolved to quit Rome; but that resolution held only a few days, as is said, from the difficulty of knowing what place to retire to; and how the matter

will end is extremely uncertain; though, it is probable, by his fixing on some place northward, where he can receive easily the visits and contributions of his party, and from whence he can join them upon occasion.

Had he declared, when the cardinal found he could not be acknowledged, that he desired to be in private, all ranks would then have received him with decency, and he would not have suffered the mortifications which he has since undergone.

The Romans had conceived him to be a debauchee: but his behaviour at Rome has been perfectly sober and affable.

The roman government, it seems, allowed the father twelve thousand crowns [about 3000l. sterling] a year, the reversion of which was settled on the cardinal for his life; and six thousand crowns more were usually given him; three at *Christmas*, and three at the *Villegiatura;* which sum has been refused to be allowed to the son.

The only riches left by the father, are said to be one hundred thousand crowns, which are lodged in the bank at Rome.

I am now going southward; when I shall have passed Lyons, I will send you some account of that city, and the other general places of education, with which our countrymen have connexion, in this kingdom. Afterward, a like account for Switzerland and Italy, unless I should get too much dissipated."

APPENDIX.

NUMBER IV.

Teſtimonies relative to the State of Popery in *Ireland*.

I. *Extract of a Letter, dated* Ashby de la Zouch, March 10, 1766, *in the* Gentleman's Magazine *for* April, 1766, p. 172.

"IT is long since I formed a design of communicating my sentiments of the state of "the romish religion in Ireland to the public, "and the evil thereof, with a scheme for "amending it; but meeting with an extract of "a letter from an english gentleman, who "made the tour of Ireland last summer, giving "an account of the pilgrimage of *Lough* "*Finn*" (see the Gentleman's Magazine for February, 1766, p. 60,) "with the gentleman's "remarks on the pernicious consequences at-"tending it, I could not any longer be at "rest, while I thought of any thing that might

"advance religion, or the welfare of any of "his majesty's dominions, especially that Island "which Providence ordered to be the place "wherein I first drew the breath of life."

The letter-writer, having given an accounnt of some other superstitious practices in different parts of Ireland, and of the correspondence of the popish clergy in that kingdom with Rome, for the purpose of authenticating these devotions, proceeds as follows:

"In the year 1736, a particular friend of "mine went a journey of about sixty miles, "and where she lodged at night, she fell in "discourse with the woman of the house, who "took her for a papist, as she spoke the Irish "very well, and she did not undeceive her; "and in their discourse the woman asked her, "if she had heard the news? My friend asked, "what news? It was answered, that they had "been praying for the young prince, that is, "the pretender, by order of a bull that came "from the pope for that purpose to all the "clergy throughout the kingdom; and that "the priest told them, viz. the congregation, "that in a few years he would come over him-"self, and that there would be a massacre of "the protestants precede his coming. In the "year 1743, it was a current report, that there "was a night fixed for this horrid act, and "that one of them discovered the plot; whe-"ther it was certain truth I cannot say, but in "all my life I never saw so light a night, and "several of our neighbours were cautious of "going to bed; and though nothing happen-"ed, yet how probable might it be to be de-"signed? For, as a simple country woman

" could discourse of it, and tell of the rebel-
" lion nine years before it happened, what
" need there a plainer demonstration, as she
" took my friend for one of her own sect, and
" spoke it in the innocence of her heart?

" About this time also, and while the war
" with France continued, there was scarce a part
" of Ireland which had not French officers re-
" cruiting in it; some appeared as young cler-
" gymen come home after perfecting their
" education; others, from their travels, to see
" their friends, &c. Observe, they were all,
" or most, Irishmen; and though they escaped
" the notice of the legislature, yet they got
" several thousand recruits. How serviceable
" they were to the French, we need only
" judge by their bravery on board our navy;
" for several thousands of these papists enter
" into our sea and land-service in England,
" in the time of war."

II. *Extract of a Letter, dated* Dublin, May 1, 1766. *From the* St. James's Chronicle, May 31, 1766.

" SIR,

" HAVING some time ago seen in your paper " a description of the danger this kingdom " has been in for several years past, from the " machinations of domestic popish enemies, I " expected to have seen the heavy charge laid " on them contradicted, or some of the facts " explained away. Nothing, however, has " appeared in their defence, * which argues " conscious guilt, and submission, for once, to " convictive evidence, that there is, and has " been for several years past, a popish plot " carrying on in Ireland, in favour of France " and a popish pretender to the dominions of " his M——y K. George. This, Sir, is a " truth as clear as the day to all but those who " are or have been engaged in it, or those who " have found their interest in affecting to dis- " believe it. Some of the proofs of it I shall " recite to you, and will relate nothing but " known fact, without any comment of my " own. On the first nightly risings of the " people called *white boys*, from wearing shirts " over other clothing, like the *Camisars* of " the *Cevennes*, in Louis XIVth's time, † notice

* This seems to have been written before Lord Taaffe's pamphlet and the other, concerning the trials of the persons accused of the murder of Bridge, appeared.

† The *Camisars* or *Camisards* of the *Cevennes* were so called, not from wearing shirts over their cloathing, but from a loose linen upper garment, like our carters frocks, which was part of their usual apparel.

" was given to the government of their pro-
" ceedings from time to time, but long disre-
" garded, nor even listened to, till some no-
" blemen and gentlemen, who left their coun-
" try for the safety of their persons, made
" vigorous applications to have them timely
" suppressed, and pointed out the methods
" most likely to take effect.———

" —— They were told, it was their own
" fault, that these risings were not speedily
" suppressed; that they had a legal power to
" commit to prison all disturbers of the pub-
" lic peace; and much more to that purpose.
" A nobleman of great fortune and spirit re-
" plied, it was impossible for a constable, ar-
" med only with his staff, to seize five hundred
" riotous persons, and requested some parties
" of the army might be sent to quell them.
" But all that could be obtained was to issue
" two or three proclamations, recommending,
" in very soft terms, peace and quietness to
" those deluded poor people.——The danger,
" however, and mischiefs increasing in pro-
" portion as indulgence was allowed them,
" ——it was at last obtained that Drogheda's
" regiment of light horse should be stationed
" in the three counties where those people
" mustered. Many criminals were taken,
" many detected, but the last not prosecuted.
" ———One jesuit in one of those counties
" was taken by surprise. His letters, ready
" to be sent to the chief, seized; in one of
" which were these words,—I shall send you
" twelve stout men well armed for the good
" cause, &c. The information was sent by
" immediate express where it was proper.

" ————It was said only the poor man was " actually mad, that the twelve men were only " designed to maintain a possession, &c.———— " I shall acquaint you with what I do know. " I know, there was not, at that time, a pa- " pist in the whole kingdom who was not " taxed, and, on pain of excommunication, " required to pay certain sums, to be disposed " of some way or other. ————Seven popish " regiments were ordered to be inlisted for the " service of Portugal, but dropped afterwards. " ————The popish noblemen and gentlemen " destined to command this army—held [like " that in James the second's time] a high com- " mission court, and with full as much power " over their own people as the former had."

III. *Extract of a Letter, dated* Dublin, June 8, 1766. *From the* St. James's Chronicle, August 28, 1766.

" Sir,

" As by your paper I perceive there is a great " increase of popish friars, priests, and jesuits, " in and about London, and that you have " given very proper warning of the danger " arising from such increase, I shall, in hopes " of its falling into proper hands, assure you " the increase here is beyond belief. On Sa- " turday the 15th of February last, I happen- " ed, as my profession obliged me, to attend " the judges at a sea-port town in the west of " this kingdom. After the court broke up " that day, I went to dine at a village near the " shore, where I saw eight jesuits, four priests, " and eleven pupils, arrive from Nantes in " France, from on board a ship commanded " by P—— D——: attending the judges from " another assize town, I saw these identical " persons going to mass; and, while I stopped, " I heard one say, this place would serve for " the foundation of Doctor F——'s school, as it " is large enough to contain above 100 pupils. " I am sorry to say, no notice was taken of my " information.————But there is one gen- " tleman, eminent for his sense, and remark- " able for his intrepid zeal for the laws, who " hourly hazards his life in the most riotous " part of this kingdom, in defence of his coun- " try. This gentleman is a justice of the peace " for the county of Dublin, where no judge

" ever goes, but the justices themselves sit as " judges of Oyer and Terminer. As I think " his charge is worthy of being read, by in- " serting the following extract from it, you " will oblige

" Your constant Reader,

" I. C."

Extract from a Charge given to the Grand Jury of the County of Dublin, *at the Quarter Sessions held for the said County, at* Kilmainham, *on the 9th day of* April, 1766, *by Sir* EDWARD NEWNHAM, *Knt. Published at the request of the Grand Jury.*

" ——No doubt but you all have heard of " those riots and unlawful tumults, committed " by those deluded persons stiled White Boys. " ——The reason of my mentioning these cir- " cumstances, is only to remind you of the great " necessity there is (should this county ever " be unfortunately infected with such lawless " people) that you should, as freeholders, join " the proper magistrates to crush them in " their infancy.————But though I am as " true a lover of freedom, liberty, and the " civil power, as any man, I must observe to " you, that, in some cases, it is impossible to " execute the laws without a military force. " The particular circumstances of this king- " dom since the glorious revolution, have " made a constant military force necessary for " the preservation of the protestant religion, " our liberties and properties.————I will " only state one case; suppose a rising of per- " sons of the popish persuasion in a popish

" barony, county, or district. A magistrate " calls for the aid of the civil power. How " can he get it? Can any man say that a pa- " pist will arm against a papist? It is an ab- " surdity to imagine it. If that be the case, " is not a military force necessary? Those well " spoken, but, I fear, not real friends to our " happy established constitution, ought to fly " to the posts of honour, and shew their patrio- " tic spirit in repelling the impending danger. " ————I must observe to you, that " though the lenity of our government makes " them wink at the papists exercising their re- " ligion publicly, yet they will not remain " quiet, notwithstanding that indulgence. " The late trials in Clonmell and Kilkenny are " sufficient evidences of their bad intentions; " their swearing thousands of his Majesty's " subjects they will neither pay tithes, nor al- " low the established clergy to gather them; " their levelling walls and ditches, under pre- " tence of their being commons, are, in fact, " nothing but a specimen of their more daring " intentions.————There are of late num- " bers of jesuits and friars come into this king- " dom. These people have presumed to set " up schools of popish superstition, and friaries, " some of which are in your district. I am not for " persecuting any persons for their opinions in " religion. It is contrary to humanity, and " the tenets of our most excellent religion, to " prosecute or despise a person for being of a " different faith from ourselves. But it is a " true rule of human œconomy, that charity " begins at home. I believe most of the resi- " dent papists of this kingdom would be peace a-

" ble subjects, if it was not for the arrival of num-
" bers of jesuits and friars, who were banished
" from other kingdoms as pests to civil society.
" The wisdom of the most bigoted popish coun-
" tries have thought it necessary to banish
" them, for their attempt to overturn every
" rule and order among men; even Kings
" themselves have near been made the sacrifice
" of their blind zeal. From these circumstan-
" ces, I should recommend it to your care to
" watch them; you have several ways to
" punish them, by presentment, or indictment,
" for assuming functions and characters not
" allowed by law."

From a late publication relative to the affairs of Ireland, in 1763, 1764, it appears that " many of the persons concerned in the risings " both in the north and south of that king- " dom, had been indicted for high treason, that " several had been executed upon the statute,— " that combinations had been formed against " paying the church dues,—that these combi- " nations had been attended with circumstances " more terrible and alarming than was generally " known,—that many papists in the dio- " cese of Waterford, who were tenants at " will, and who were liable to be displaced to " their great disadvantage, had entered into " these combinations against the minister of the " parish,--that being acquainted, that if they " did join in such combinations, they would be " dismissed, they replied, that if they were " dismissed they could not help it, that it " would be a misfortune, but that it would " be still the least of two evils; for they had " better be dismissed, than have their throats

" cut, which would be the certain consequence " of their refusing to concur in the combina- " tion. And it was understood, that a com- " bination into which associates were pressed " by the fear of death, and in which, there- " fore, many violate the peace of the state, " contrary to their inclination and interest, " might in a short time subvert the constitu- " tion, and defeat all the laws that had been " enacted to prevent public evils, arising from " the growth of popery." Page 47, 48--84, 85.

I desire it may be observed, that these extracts are appealed to only as exhibiting evidence of the spirit of popery in Ireland, at the periods of time in question; and that I have omitted all reflections intermixed with the narratives, farther than was necessary to connect the accounts of the main facts, not only as I am no judge of the truth or propriety of such reflections, but as they are nothing to my purpose, which is to shew by competent evidence, in answer to the pamphlet ascribed to Lord Taaffe, and other publications to the same effect, that the temper of the Irish papists has not been so peaceable and submissive to government, as the writers of those pamphlets have effected to represent. It is to little purpose to say, that these disturbers of the public peace were the scum and refuse of the people. Sir Edward Newnham, we see, was candid enough to believe that " most of the resident " papists of Ireland would be peaceable subjects, " if it were not for the number of jesuits and " friars among them." It is not unreasonable to suppose that the roman catholic nobility and

gentry of that kingdom might find the means to controul the influence of these jesuits upon the common people ; and, as they are under the protection of no civil law, why do they not, unless they consider these jesuits as incased in the armour of the church, to which good catholics of every degree are equally obliged to submit. The consequences of which principle to those protestant governments under which they entertain it, sojourn, need not be explained.

POSTSCRIPT:

CONTAINING

Remarks on a late Apology for the Catholics of Great Britain *and* Ireland.

WHAT has been offered in the foregoing Considerations, tending to shew the danger of tolerating popery, will, I hope, be understood, as it was intended, to include a defence of the laws of our country that have laid the papists under those restraints and incapacities of which they are disposed at this period so loudly to complain. Our ancestors took their accounts of popish principles from books which the church of Rome had authenticated in form, and the circumstances attending the treasons and conspiracies of which so many particular papists had been convicted, afforded sufficient reason to conclude that their church patronized their attempts, and applied her principles to the justification of the criminals. With this complicated evidence before them, it became necessary to guard the constitution from the effects of the perpetual machinations of these dangerous inmates, by such laws as would be most effectual in depriving them of

the power of accomplishing the mischief they never ceased to meditate.

The present pretence for having those laws superseded, is, that the occasions upon which they were enacted no longer subsist. The meaning of which, to make this a good reason for silencing those laws, should be, that the papists have now renounced those principles which rendered their forefathers obnoxious to the government under which they lived. For barely to say, that the papists have not, for some years backward, engaged in the same kind of treasons and conspiracies that their forefathers did, is only saying that the laws enacted for securing the public against the pernicious tendency of their principles, have had a good effect: which, while the same principles are still espoused by the papists of the present age, is the best reason in the world for continuing the laws against them in full force and vigour; as the natural consequence of repealing them must be, an immediate return to their endeavours to subvert our constitution, to which they must be urged by their principles with the more alacrity, as they might then take their measures for that purpose with impunity.

If indeed the papists of the present times can give sufficient assurance to our governors in church and state, that they have absolutely and effectually renounced those obnoxious principles which their forefathers espoused, and have adopted others perfectly reconcileable to their dutiful submission to the present government of Great Britain and Ireland, they will then have a plea for toleration, which

must make all the arguments against it, taken from the contrary supposition, go for nothing. They will then stand upon the same footing with the protestant dissenters from our ecclesiastical establishment; and whenever it can be made appear that they have the same affection for, and the same common interest to support, the civil constitution of these kingdoms upon its present basis, the toleration of popery, as a merely religious sect, will, upon protestant principles, stand clear of all objection.

The question then is, "have the papists of "these days disclaimed, or have they, in any "degree, modified, the pernicious principles "of their forefathers, so as to put themselves "into a condition to be tolerated with equal "safety to the state, as the protestant dissenters "are tolerated?"

To enable us to judge of this matter, it hath happened very seasonably, and very fortunately for the public, that a book hath just appeared on the behalf of the papists, which gives us sufficiently full and clear information on that head, intitled,—*An apology for the Catholics of* Great Britain *and* Ireland, *humbly offered to the consideration of the King's most excellent Majesty, and both houses of Parliament.*

The catholics, as they chuse to call themselves, having furnished us with this test of their principles, at a time when they thought it necessary to give the government the most favourable view both of their religious and political tenets, cannot complain of any wrong we do them, in being determined by their own

representation: and if it shall appear from a short examination of this apology, that the papists of the present times still adhere, without any modification, to the religious and political system of the most obnoxious of their forefathers, the inference will be obvious, that they ought still to be kept within the same restraints.

Let us then begin with inquiring what were the principal inducements with our forefathers to enact the penal and incapacitating laws against papists, now in force? And these were chiefly three:

1. Their acknowledging, and professing their absolute submission to a FOREIGN JURISDICTION, at utter enmity with every government administred by a protestant sovereign.*

2. Their principle of INTOLERANCE, excluding all who differ from their religious tenets, or who refuse obedience to the foreign jurisdiction abovementioned, from all civil privileges, and dooming them to capital punishment, under the name of heretics.

3. Their assiduous and never ceasing endeavours to seduce the subjects of protestant states to these pernicious principles.

* Perhaps it should rather have been said, "at utter enmity with "every government which will not admit of its arbitrary decisions, "whether protestant or not." For thus is the pope characterised by "the English parliament of 1536.——"The bishop of Rome "(whom some call the pope) who had long darkened God's word, "that it might serve his pomp, glory, avarice, ambition, and tyranny, both upon the souls, bodies and goods of all christians, "excluding Christ out of the rule of man's soul, and princes out of "their dominions." Burnet Hist. of the Reformation, vol. I. p. 211. For doubtless this was no protestant parliament with respect to the doctrinal articles of the Romish faith.

The person at the head of this foreign jurisdiction, is agreed, on all hands, to be the pope or the bishop of Rome, of whose pre-eminence our apologist, in the name of *all catholics*, gives the following account.

" In the catholic church there is the pope, " or supreme representative and vicar of Jesus " Christ upon earth, as being the successor of " St. Peter in the see of Rome; and the parti- " cular church of Rome, for this reason, is " stiled the mother and mistress of all other " churches, and the invariable centre of their " unity. The heads of other particular chur- " ches are also all princes of the catholic " church, and vicars and representatives of " Jesus Christ in the districts of their respec- " tive governments; as are likewise all priests, " for they all represent Jesus Christ in the dis- " charge of the functions of their ministry. " But for the purposes of good government, " the priests are subordinate to the bishops, " the bishops to the archbishops, and *all to-* " *gether* to the supreme representative of Je- " sus Christ, the bishop of Rome." Apology, p. 136.

But if *all together*, then the vicar-princes among others, and the degrees of subordination will then stand thus: " the priests are " subordinate to the bishops, the bishops to " the archbishops, the archbishops to the " princes, and the princes to the pope." But by lumping them *all together*, he avoided mentioning, that according to the catholic faith, the clergy *are not* subordinate to princes, even in the districts of their respective governments, at the same time that the princes *are* subordinate to the pope.

With respect to the subordination of princes to the pope, he is indeed sufficiently explicit in what follows.

" The pope, by the authority of the power " received from the son of God, is the head " of christians, the pastor of the people, the " father of kings, and God's vicegerent upon " earth," p. 138. And again; " it has al- " ways been judged necessary that there should " be between princes, not so much an impar- " tial chief, as an universal father of the " whole family of Jesus Christ, who might " decide their differences, moderate, by his " counsels, the violence of those who have " engaged in unjust enterprizes, and unite " their power and arms for guarding the faith, " from the attempts of its natural enemies." P. 139.

Will the apologist then grant, that heretical princes, withdrawing themselves and their people from the obedience of the mother and mistress of all other churches, and of the universal father of the whole family of Jesus Christ, are not the natural enemies of the faith? It is a question of consequence to his apology. For if he does not make this concession, it will unavoidably follow, that all catholics, and English and Irish catholics among others, hold it a principal part of the pope's office to unite the power and arms of catholic princes against the natural enemies of the faith, in Great Britain and Ireland as well as elsewhere.

It is of very litte significance, to protestant princes, and protestant states, that this apologist pretends to limit the pope's interference

among catholic princes to a mere mediatorship, with respect to their differences one among another. Their obedience to the pope requires, that they should unite their power and arms against the rebellious sons of this common father of kings wherever they are found. And however gracious his holiness may be to those who will accept of his mediation, there is plainly nothing, according to this apologist, for those who will not, but utter extermination.

Where then is the difference between this doctrine of this catholic apologist and that of *Sanctarellus*, who, as the apologist informs us, taught that "the popes cannot only excommunicate princes, but also deprive them of "their kingdoms, absolve their subjects from "their allegiance, and afterwards give their "states to whom he thinks proper, either for "heresy, apostasy, or for not having defended "the church." p. 142.——In what does this doctrine differ from that of the apologist, for if the pope has authority to unite the power and arms of catholic princes against the natural enemies of the church, and if apostate and heretical princes are such enemies, nothing can be more absurd than to suppose the pope has not the authority, to use his own proper and peculiar power and arms for the same sacred purpose!

The apologist would persuade us that this doctrine was thought strange when broached by *Sanctarellus*, even at the same time that he carries us as far back as Gregory VII (the famous Hildebrand) for the original of it, who lived near 600 years before *Sanctarellus*.

Would he pretend that any of the popes after Gregory, renounced this doctrine,* or that

* To the fact may be called a Roman catholic writer cited by *Du Pleſſis* in his *Myſterium Iniquitatis*, p. 245. Ed. 1611. " Et " hæc ab Hildebrando, qui primus imperium pontificium condidit, " quod ſucceſſores per quadringentos quinquaginta continenter an- " nos, invito mundo, invitis imperatoribus, adeo auxĕre, ut inferos " ſuperos in ſervitutem redegerint atque ſub jugum miſerint, atque " cuncta fulmine perterritent,

" Quo bruta tellus, & vaga flumina,
" Quo ſtyx & inviſi horrida tænari
" Sedes, atlantæuſque finis
" Concutitur. Mutat ima ſummis."

With reſpect to the pope's pretenſions to the power of depoſing princes, we have ſo ſtrong an inſtance of the holy ſee's inflexibility upon that point, in the ſtate papers collected by Edward Earl of Clarendon, lately publiſhed, that I need not make any excuſe to the proteſtant reader for lengthening this note with ſo curious and remarkable a teſtimony. In the year 1633, father Leander, a Benedictine monk, obtained leave of King Charles I. by the means of ſecretary Windebank, and under pretence of viſiting his relations, to come over from Douay to England. See p. 72, of theſe ſtate papers. When he was got hither, he was in no haſte to go back, and, as it ſhould ſeem, was permitted to ſtay, upon the pretence of being uſeful to the government in procuring the Engliſh romaniſts to take the oath of allegiance and ſupremacy to the king. The pope had iſſued a bull prohibiting the catholic ſubjects of England to take that oath. Leander ſet on foot a correſpondence with ſome perſons of power at Rome, particularly the cardinals Barberini and Bentivoglio, wherein he uſed divers arguments to ſhew the expedience of ſuſpending the execution of the abovementioned bull, and, among the reſt, the probability of bringing over the whole kingdom of England to the catholic faith by ſuch a meaſure. He even ſet himſelf to defend the oath, and to ſhew, by certain qualifications of the terms in which it was expreſſed, that it was not incompatible with the obedience due from a good catholic to the holy ſee. Among his correſpondents at Rome, was one Richard Reade, procurator of the congregation of the benedictines in England, who went by the name of John Wilfrid Selbye, See p. 169. This Wilfrid, or Wilford, as he calls himſelf, had the care of Leander's correſpondence at Rome, and, as appears, informed him, from time to time, how his intelligence and his propoſals were received and reliſhed by

Sanctarellus was the only writer who advanced it in all that interval between Gregory VII and Lewis XIII?

the apoſtolic government, which it ſeems was ſo very indifferently, that Wilford adviſed him, for his own ſake, to meddle no more with the controverſy about the oath, and having given Leander his reaſons why the oath as enjoined by the Engliſh government would not paſs at Rome, he ſays :—" I fear, therefore, ſome other form of oath " muſt be thought upon, whereby his majeſty may abundantly, and " ſuperabundantly, if any thing can ſuperabound in this kind, be " ſecured of his ſubjects fidelity, and yet there be no entrenching " upon ſubjects conſcience, nor the authority of this ſeat, which, " having ſtood for her right ſo many ages, in the cauſe of depoſing " princes, will be very unwilling to permit the oath as the words " lie, although gloſſed with another intention. Look over the " oath, which uſually is exhibited to the catholics in Ireland ; ex- " amine other forms of oaths in catholic countries, add to them, aug- " ment them, and endeavour to form them in that kind, and in " thoſe words, which may ſecure and content his majeſty, as is moſt " juſt and reaſonable to be done ; yet take heed of meddling with " deponibility of princes, for that article will never paſs here." *State papers*, &c. p. 272. I cannot help obſerving that our apologiſt ſeems to be playing the ſame game with this father Leander, and probably the checks he mentions, in his juſtificative piece (lately ſubjoined to the apology,) to have received from ſome of his own communion, might be in terms like theſe of father Wilford. The apologiſt pretends that the doctrine of *Sanctarellus* appeared ſtrange in France ; which however was by no means the caſe ; for, beſides the remains of the leaguers who eſpouſed it, it was not without the approbation of ſome learned men, who had no connection with that infamous faction. Gabriel Naude, for example, library-keeper to cardinal Mazarine, characteriſes Gregory VII. in the following reſpectful terms. " He was one of the greateſt pillars of the church, " and to ſpeak of him ſincerely and impartially, he was the firſt who " put her in poſſeſſion of her franchiſes, and who freed the ſovereign " pontifs from the ſlavery of the emperors." *Bayle*, GREGORY VII. *Rem.* [A.] And indeed, whatever might be thought of the doctrine of Gregory or Sanctarellus upon political emergencies by particular catholic princes, it always was uniformly the doctrine of the holy ſee, and of the capital writers in behalf of the church, ſuch as Bellarmine and Baronius, the latter of whom, as we ſhall ſee preſently, derived this ſuperiority of the popes above kings and emperors from a much remoter ſource than Gregory VII. In the year

It is indeed probable enough that *Sanctarellus* might be put upon writing this book by the Spaniards, to mortify the French king and his ministers; but still we find it was approved and authorized by the Roman pontif, and that the French alone, for political reasons, opposed and condemned the doctrine of it. The apologist would have us believe that he approves of the methods taken by the French to suppress this doctrine, though indeed he hath no where said so in express terms. But all this is but mere grimace, for there is not one step taken by the French in contesting this unlimited power of the pope, as represented by this apologist, which he hath not reprobated in some passage or other of this very apology.

" The Parisian faculty of divinity, he informs us, in a full assembly, condemned the " doctrine of *Sanctarellus*, though it was favoured by some of the old league," p. 143. He might, and he ought to have added, " and " by the whole body of Jesuits."* What the

1573, Gregory's body was searched for in St. Matthew's church at Salerno, and said to be found, and the following epitaph inscribed upon a monument erected to his memory by Marc Antony Colonna, archbishop of that see. " Gregorio VII. Soanensi, Pont. Opt. " Max. Ecclesiasticæ Libertatis vindici acerrimo, assertori constan- " tissimo, qui, dum Romani Pontificis auctoritatem adversus Hen- " rici perfidiam strenue tuetur, Salerni sancte decubuit, anno dom. " 1085. 8 Kal. Junii." It is now near 200 years since this honour was done to Gregory VII. for his strenuous asserting the papal power against the Emperor Henry IV. and if in all that time the apologist cannot find one instance where the popes have disclaimed it, he will bring his British and Irish catholics into a disagreeable alternative, viz. either of espousing Sanctarellus's doctrine, or of deserting the holy see in its claim of a *fathership* over kings. See *Bayle, ubi supra*, Rem. [Q.]

* See the examination of the jesuits upon this doctrine of Sanctarellus, by the parliament of Paris, in the *Monarchie de Socipses Remarques sur le chap.* 6. p. 60.

apologist thought of this condemnation, we shall see when we come to the reasons they gave for it.

In the mean time we go on with him.—— "And not to leave the king's power inactive "on so important an occasion, the parliament, which was then the depository of it, "cited the principal fathers of the Jesuits to "appear before them, and obliged them to "sign a declaration, whereby they condemned it, and to procure a like declaration to "be subscribed by all the provincials and rectors, and by six elders of each of their colleges in France; and the parliament afterwards ordered the book to be burnt by the "hands of the common executioner, with "a prohibition to all booksellers to sell any "of the like quality." *Ibid.*

The parliament of France decided in this instance, against the pope, a point of his holiness's pastoral prerogative, of no small importance; a point, which, as appears by the licensing *Sanctarellus's* book at Rome, the pope was by no means disposed to give up. The parliament did more; they obliged a whole body of ecclesiastics, the pope's own creatures, to condemn the doctrine asserting this prerogative, by a formal subscription, and doomed the book that contained it to the flames.

Does the *Apologist* think they did right in taking this process upon them? He hath not told us whether he does or no; but we may learn perhaps a little more of his mind by considering what he says of the doings of another parliament on a similar occasion.

Speaking of the title conferred upon king

Henry VIII. of supreme head of the church under Christ, he says, " let us touch upon the " nature of the power that invested the king " with this high-sounding prerogative, this " blasphemous jurisdiction, as Calvin calls it, " and dissolved his marriage with Catherine " of Arragon. What was the power that was " able to effect these mighty matters? it was " nothing more than the parliament of Eng- " land; an assembly of men, that acknow- " ledge themselves fallible; for if they did " not they would not so often have rescin- " ded their own acts. An assembly of men, " intirely calculated for judging and de- " ciding in civil matters, and for enacting " laws for the purposes of good government, " according to the several contingencies of " temporal concerns. But these same men " could venture out of their latitude, and " what the consciences of all the rest of chris- " tendom abhorred as unjustifiable, they, with " a composure of conscience, and acquies- " cence of mind in well-doing, brought to " pass." p. 59.

Every word of which *Sanctarellus* might with equal justice and propriety have applied to the parliament of Paris. " An assembly of " men calculated intirely for civil matters— " fallible—often rescinding their own acts— " confined, by the nature of their powers, to " temporal matters—going out of their lati- " tude to decide what the universal father of " christians might or might not do in cases of " heresy and apostasy—and bringing to pass " what, in the days of Henry VIII. the con- " sciences of all good catholics would un-

" doubtedly have abhorred as unjustifiable."

Will the apologist say, that the two cases differ;--that for a parliament to exempt their prince from papal censures in cases of heresy or apostasy, and to confer upon him the title and privileges of the supreme head of the church, are two things, that, in point of presumption, will admit of no comparison?

I ask his pardon; the difference between the two cases, if he has given us a true account of the Frenchmen's reasons for their decisions, is imperceptible.

" The French argued against *Sanctarellus*," says he, " in support of their kings, that they " were appointed by the hand of God, who " had made use of their swords [the people's " swords,] for placing the crown on their " head, and God had not laid down apostasy, " heresy, or any other crime, as a condition " to make void their authority, it being his " will to make equally the good and bad to " reign; consequently they could not be de- " posed but by God himself, nor forfeit their " authority by any crime." p. 145.

But, if this be true, kings are totally a distinct power from popes; popes can have no more authority over kings, than kings have over popes. The Almighty and immediate power of God intervenes in both cases to exclude all other authority; according to the Frenchmen, the pope could have nothing to do with their king, even though he were an heretic or an apostate, and the parliament of France in thus judging, and upon these principles, did indeed neither less nor more in effect than the parliament of England did in declaring Henry VIII.

to be the supreme head of the church under Christ. For a king of France, being an heretic, was authorized by this determination to set up an heretical church in his own kingdom, and to become the supreme head of it, as much as Henry VIII. of England, and with as little regard to the pope.

For let us ask, how did the pope endeavour to help himself, on this revolt of the king and parliament of England? "He thundered a "most terrible sentence of deposition against "the king, and designed to commit the exe- "cution of it to the emperor." Burnet, hist. Reform. vol. 1. p. 211. In other words, he put in practice the doctrine of the apologist; he endeavoured to unite the arms of certain catholic powers to defend the faith against the natural enemy of it. But the parliament of France were of opinion that his holiness overshot himself in this business, and had no authority to pass any such sentence. The apologist may now choose whether he will acquit or condemn the French parliament, for it is now clear that the parliament of England must be acquitted or condemned along with it.*

* See bishop Burnet's censure of Mr. *De Meaux's* history of the variations of the protestant churches (at the end of his letter to *Mr. Thevenot*, containing a censure of *Mr. Le Grand's* history of king Henry the eighth's divorce,) p. 33, 34; where the bishop observes, that "the French courts of parliament are the last resort "even in spiritual matters; and receive all appeals under the pre- "tence of some abuse in the sentence, so that the whole exercise of "the episcopal power is subject to the secular court. And," says his lordship, "whatsoever they may talk of their union with the "holy see, even in this they are also subject to the secular court, "since no bull or breve can be executed in France without an ap- "probation from thence. And yet these are the men that complain "of the king's supremacy among us, though there is nothing clearer

It is a vexatious case upon the apologist, I own; but before we part I will shew him something still more wonderful, namely, that a king and parliament of England could not only make a church, but upon occasion a pope, and that in spite of the cardinal-electors.

But, notwithstanding his fair words, let no man imagine that he thinks as the French parliament did. Shall he reverse his own system *du fond en comble?* If the French divinity is good, what must become of the apologist's *father of kings*, and *God's vicegerent on earth?* A strange father surely, who has no authority to disinherit a rebellious and apostate son; and a strange vicegerent of God, who has no power or authority to punish apostasy, the most grievous crime that can be committed against God! For as the case is stated by the Sorbonnists, the pope's spiritual power is excluded from it equally with his temporal. Whereas our apologist is not for having the pope made so contemptible.

"Besides, say the Frenchmen, if kings "could be deposed by the popes, it would "follow, that the popes are their superiors in "temporals, such deposition being an act of "superior jurisdiction." *Apology*, p. 145.

This however does plainly follow from our apologist's doctrine. "If the pope," says he, "was made contemptible by the little respect "princes might bear him, what opinion should "they have of his being able to effect those "purposes? [Namely, the purposes, among

"than that this servitude lies much heavier on them than it does on "us." Which the bishop goes on to shew. This tract was published in 1689.

others, of uniting the power and arms of catholic princes for guarding the faith from the attempts of its natural enemies.] "And what "authority could he pretend to for appeasing "their differences? *They would force him to "keep within the bounds of his spiritual power, "without interfering with their temporal in-"terests;* and yet the fire of war would be kind-"led among them with such heat, as to de-"stroy themselves and their states in flames." P. 139.

Why, ay; to be sure the popes have extinguished many more of these flames than they have kindled. But how should the popes be able to do either without exercising a temporal power superior to the power of those princes, with whose interests they interfere? Particularly how, without such superior temporal power, should they be able to unite the power and arms of catholic princes against the natural enemies of the faith, heretics and apostates? The doctrine therefore of the Frenchmen must be wrong, in the opinion of the apologist, and his producing it with an implied approbation is but a copy of his countenance.

The reader will be pleased to observe, that, should the apologist be called to account for these opposite doctrines, he hath managed the matter so as to come off by distinguishing between the French arguments against *Sanctarellus*, and his own in behalf of the pope's superiority. And indeed, after the high-sounding attributes he hath given to the pope, it would be ridiculous to suppose him in earnest, when he pretends to urge what follows in the Frenchmen's argument as the catholic sentiments of British and Irish papists.

Let us, however, allow for a while, that the remaining part of the argument is his own, though ascribed to the Frenchmen, and upon that presumption examine to what it will amount.

" But the popes are so far from being supe-
" rior to them [kings] in that point [tempo-
" rals,] that, on the contrary, the most re-
" nowned of antiquity have ingenuously de-
" clared, that they were inferior to them, and
" that their power was purely spiritual. There
" is ample testimony of this in a letter of pope
" Gelasius to the Emperor Anastasius; Pela-
" gius I. acknowledged the same, in a letter
" to Childebert king of France; and St.
" Gregory to the Emperor Mauritius, and in
" such express terms, that their intention
" cannot be doubtful." p. 146.

This picking three popes out of three hundred, of which three, Gregory, the latest, died eleven hundred years ago, to witness their inferiority to temporal princes, is pleasant enough. But let us hear what they have to say.

Gelasius, in the epistle referred to, says nothing of superiority or inferiority. He only says that the popes and emperors acted in distinct provinces, and were mutually serviceable to each other, *ut et modestia utriusque ordinis curaretur, ne extolleretur utroque suffultus.** The consequence of which doctrine is, that the pope is excluded from every degree of temporal power, in direct contradiction to the apologist, who is not pleased with those who are for forcing his holiness to keep within the

* Gelasius de anathematis vinculo, apud Pleſſæum. Myſt. Iniq. p. 78.

bounds of his spiritual power; p. 139. But this is not the worst; for Platina tells us, there were accounts extant, that this very pope Gelasius excommunicated the Emperor Anastasius for being a favourer of heretics, and particularly of Acacius; of which Platina makes a precedent for other popes to follow in similar cases.* What security an heretic prince could have in the temporal inferiority of such a pope, let the reader judge.

Pelagius, the next example, was in woeful plight when he wrote to Childebert. He had, by attempting to force the council of Constantinople upon the Italian bishops, to please the Emperor Justinian, provoked those bishops to revolt, and to withdraw from his obedience. On this occasion he applied to Narses the emperor's general, then in Italy, to reduce the rebellious bishops to order by force of arms; and, for his encouragement, decreed that "heretics and schismatics might be punished "by the secular powers, when they could not "be cured by reason and argument."† Pelagius being thus at war with his neighbouring bishops, he could not expect that much regard should be shewn him by the French bishops at a greater distance, and who disliked the coun-

* Sunt qui scribant Gelasium excommunicasse Anastasium imperatorem Constantinopolitanum, Zenonis successorem, quod hæreticis & Acacio faveret. Unde constat imperatorem errantem in fide, & monitum, si non paruerit a Pontifice Romano excommunicari posse. *Platina in Gelasio*, 1 *Edit. Colon.* 1562. *p.* 61.

† Pelagius—constituit ut hæretici & schismatici coerceri etiam secularium manu possent, quando ad sanitatem rationibus non deducerentur. *Platina, ut supra, p.* 69.

cil of Constantinople as much as the Italians did. In this state of things the French bishops held a council at Paris, under the authority of their King Childebert, without taking the least notice of the pope. What should poor Pelagius do in such a case? A council assembled without any notice taken of the pope, might be a bad precedent for the holy see. On the other hand, to anathematize their proceedings, might disoblige Childebert, which was by no means convenient. He therefore made a virtue of necessity, and sent the confession of his faith to the French monarch, to shew his obedience, as he says, to kings, to whom the scriptures enjoined subjection.* Now if any thing can be made of this with respect to papal inferiority, it certainly is that popes are inferior to kings in spiritual matters; and if Pelagius's doctrine was sound, I do not see wherein our English parliament went wrong in conferring the supreme headship of the church under Christ upon Henry VIII.

The submission of Gregory to a law of the emperor Maurice, which intrenched no little on the privileges of the church,† is well known,

* "Quanto nobis studio ac labore satagendum est, ut pro auferendo suspicionis scandalo obsequium confessionis nostræ Regibus ministremus, quibus nos etiam subditos esse sanctæ scripturæ præcipiunt."—How pinching must that distress have been which could wring these words from a pope? It should seem indeed that some suspicions of his holiness's heterodoxy had been entertained by the French bishops. We have heard of a civil sovereign qualifying his submission to a pope with, *Non tibi, sed Petro.* Pelagius might have some such salvo in sending his confession to the French council, *Non, vobis, sed Regi vestro.*

† Ne quis miles, nondum expleta, militia, rationalis, aut administrationi publicæ implicitus, nisi rationibus prius redditis, ad ecclesiasticum munus admitteretur.

and has often been cited as binding to his successors by protestant writers; in which it seems they are justified by the French antagonists of Sanctarellus, and seemingly by our apologist. But if we are to suppose Gregory to be in earnest in this instance, why not in those passages where he makes the title of *Universal Bishop* a mark of antichrist? If this be true doctrine, what becomes of the apologist's *Universal Father* of the *whole family of Jesus Christ?* p. 139. Be it not forgot, however, that Baronius will not allow that Gregory was guilty of either of these acts of humility; and boldly affirms that Gregory, in promulging the emperor's law, made some alterations in it, and thereby shewed, it seems, that the apostolic power was superior to the imperial.*

There is no occasion to proceed any farther with the apologist on this head; and I have only gone through these last examples to shew his skill and fidelity as an historian, and dare venture my credit that there is not one point of history in his whole book wherein he hath shewn more candor, honesty, or judgement, than in these instances.† After all, he may,

* Baronius utique, qui nihil non ad ſuum commodum vertit, ita promulgaſſe cavillatur, ut eam emendarit, in eoque ipſo authoritatem apoſtolicam, principis lege ſuperiorem oſtenderit. *Pkeffæus, Myſt. Iniq.* p. 112.

† That ſuch a writer as the apologiſt ſhould avail himſelf of every ſophiſtical art in turning hiſtorical incidents to the account of his cauſe, is not wonderful. It is a trade to which, in all probability, he hath been bred from his youth. But one cannot without concern obſerve any thing of the like ſort in a writer whoſe ſuperior rank, education, and pretenſions to liberal ſentiment ſhould ſet him above ſerving any cauſe by a partial repreſentation of facts; of which,

as I observed above, alledge, that he does not make himself answerable either for the doctrine

if he was not well informed himself, he had better have left the whole subject to the management of interested priests and jesuits, than have soiled his respectable page with the dirty colourings which were only to be borrowed from them. A few citations from a late performance, intituled, *Thoughts, Essays, and Maxims, chiefly religious and political*, the work of a gentleman of distinction, will explain what I here allude to. "It is allowed by all the most sensible "and candid writers among the roman catholics," says this author, "that the many abuses which have crept into the practice and wor- "ship of the church, were *perhaps* occasioned *in part* by the cor- "ruption of the churchmen, and their too great plenitude of power." p. 42.—And, for aught that we gain by this allowance, *perhaps not*, even *in part*. For by these restrictions it is left doubtful whether any of these many abuses were occasioned by the corruption of churchmen, or their too great plenitude of power. And if these abuses did not arise from these causes, it might fairly be questioned whether there was any corruption or any excess of power among the churchmen at all? From how many writers of his own communion might this gentleman have learned how little room there is for such salvos and limitations? The single remonstrance of the council of Pisa to the emperor Maximilian, dated November 12, 1511, is sufficient to shew the state of the church, and the disposition of powerful churchmen, in those days. This was six, and but six years before Luther began his opposition to indulgences. And concerning these the disingenuous Bossuet himself could say, that "most of the "preachers of that time treated of nothing but indulgences, pilgrima- "ges, and alms to be bestowed upon the Monks, nor spake of the "grace of Christ, as much as they ought to have done." *Hist. Var. Part I. B. v.* sect. 1. Nay, even this still more disingenuous apologist could prevail with himself to acknowledge, that "the abuses "of indulgences were then very great, and cried aloud for redress." p. 35. And since these abuses took their rise from the plenitude of papal power, it seems to be going below the *modesty* and *tenderness* of a bigoted friar, to qualify the manifest occasion of them with a *perhaps* and *in part*. The polite writer goes on: "But then those "who attempted to mend or correct them, either through ignorance, "pride, or ambition, in establishing their own opinions, were so "hurried away with their passions and resentment, that they perpe- "trated murders, created civil wars, and miseries among mankind for "many years, and established *as many abuses*, and allowed of *as* "*many evil practices* in morals as those they complained of, and

of the Sorbonne, or the proceedings of the French parliament, and appeal to his own state

" pretended or attempted to reform." *Ibid.* Surely this atrocious accusation should have been supported by some facts, fixing the guilt of these murders, civil wars, and miseries upon the first reformers. Will the most yawning reader take the following instance for a full proof of all this complicated mischief? " Witness Germany, " where one of the reformers, in order to obtain the protection of a " sovereign prince, allowed him to have two wives at a time," p. 43. This, it seems, is a favourite prejudice against the reformation, among our english catholics, and is, no doubt, understood to be the sum and substance of all wickedness; and our author's manner of introducing it puts me in mind of a story I have heard of a good lady, who having surprised her husband in some suspicious circumstances with her chamber-maid, threw up the window and called out, *whores! rogues! thieves! murder! fire!* An exclamation to which the bystanders would have no great reason to pay regard, if, as in the case of the church of Rome, it had been notorious that the good lady herself had first given an example of the like infidelity. " Gregory II. being " consulted whether it was agreeable to the faith of the roman church, " that a man might take two wives, when the first was rendered in- " capable of fulfilling the marriage duty by a long malady, decided, " that, *according to the vigour of the apostolic see, if the husband* " *had not the gift of continence, he might take another wife, pro-* " *vided he afforded the first a maintenance.*" See Mr. *Basnage, Hist. de la religion des eglises reformees*, Tom. III. p. 96. The bishop of Meaux pretended that Gregory's meaning was that the first marriage should be dissolved, which was a different case from that of Luther's allowing the landgrave of Hesse to have, in Mr. Howard's phrase, *two wives at a time.* To which Mr. Basnage replies, " What is it Mr. Bossuet would say? Marriage is a sacrament " which cannot be dissolved; and the law of Jesus Christ, which or- " dains that it should not be dissolved but for the cause of adultery, " is not regarded in the church of Rome? But Gregory the se- " cond did not dissolve the marriages upon which he hath founded " his decree. He decides that a man may take a second wife, when " the first is become infirm and diseased. And the only clause of " reserve in her favour relates to her maintenance. The one case " is perfectly like the other; and, to confound those who may be " disposed to contest it, I will add in favour of the landgrave of " Hesse and Luther, that the Landgrave's first wife, the daughter of " the elector of Saxony, consented to the second marriage; reserving " to herself her rights [of dowry], and those of her children, because

of the case, which is totally inconsistent with them both. You will in vain ask him, "why

"her infirmities would not permit her to fulfil the duties of marriage, "nor to correct the violent love which the elector had conceived for "*Margaret de Sales*, and the impetuosity of his temperament. The "cases are exactly parallel. But can any one imagine that the con- "cubinage or, let us call it, the adultery of a prince subverts the re- "formation, seeing that the late Mr. *De Meaux* hath borne with a "double adultery under his eyes for a great number of years, and "perhaps baptized, communicated, and married the children born of "this double adultery? He should have been ashamed and have re- "flected upon his own personal history, before he had made that of "others, and defended it with so much vehemence." *Basnage, u. s. p.* 105. What advantage then do the papists gain by this incident? They have been told an hundred times that the protestants never thought themselves answerable for Luther's casuistry in any particular case, even though an hundred doctors among the first reformers had joined him. If indeed Luther had taught the lawfulness of bigamy in general, and if from him the body of protestants had taken that doctrine into their respective confessions, it had been incumbent upon them to have defended the allowance of Luther at all events. Instead of that, many protestants remonstrated against any such dispensation, as contrary to the law of God, both at the time it was granted, and occasionally ever since. But the papists are obliged to abide by all the dispensations of the pope and the church in matrimonial cases of all kinds. It is to no purpose for them to plead that such dispensations are against the law of God. The council of Trent hath denounced an anathema against all those who should dispute the power of the church to dispense, in cases of affinity, with the degrees of it forbidden in the law of God. *Conc. Trid.* Sess. XXIV. can. iii. p. 874. And, what is most remarkable, the British and Irish papists who object to Henry VIIIth's divorce from Catharine of Arragon, by an incompetent authority, are obliged to support the validity of the dispensation granted by Julius II to Henry to marry his brother's widow, and must consequently approve the canon of Trent in its utmost extent. Lastly, whoever it was that informed Mr. Howard, that Luther gave this dispensation to the Landgrave of Hesse, that he [Luther] might obtain the Landgrave's protection, certainly imposed upon him. Luther had enjoyed the protection of the Landgrave for fourteen or fifteen years before this event. And it may be truly said that Luther, in granting allowance to this evil practice, ran the risque of losing the protection of all the rest of the protestant princes of Germany, who certainly disapproved the second

" then did you give us this detail of french " maxims and politics, with an air of appro-

marriage. And, as this affair turned out, the Landgrave actually wanted Luther's protection to divert the ſtorm which was likely to fall upon him for this irregular conduct. For the Landgrave, fearing to be called to account by the emperor and the ſtates of Germany for this offenſive ſtep, treated with the elector of Saxony and the other parties to the Smalcaldic League, to ſtand by him in ſuch exigence, and even wrote to Luther and Melanchon for advice how to manage in this critical juncture. See Seckendorf, Hiſt. Luth. lib. III. p. 277—281. The paragraph this reſpectable author hath thrown out to diſparage the proteſtant reformation, is thus cloſed: " Examples of equal immoral tendency, variegated and adapted ac- " cording to the inclinations of the people they had to deal with, " might be found in France, Holland, and England." P. 43. Nothing can be more prudent in a roman catholic writer than to give theſe looſe and general hints, without deſcending to particulars. Theſe variegations and adaptions are ſo numerous and remarkable in his own church, that it would by no means be convenient for him to have the compariſon entered upon in a circumſtantial detail of examples. The variegations of the biſhop of Meaux alone, in his famous expoſition, were ſo notorious, that they gave great diſguſt to the members of his own communion, even to the doctors of the Sorbonne, which obliged him to ſuppreſs the firſt impreſſion of it till the exceptionable paſſages were altered. Nor would it have paſſed uncenſured at Rome, but for the boaſts of the many converts made by it in France. On which ſole conſideration it obtained the approbation of the cardinals Capiſucchi and Bona, both of whom had publiſhed doctrines contradictory to ſome in the biſhop of Meaux's expoſition. See Bayle's Dict. Capiſucchi Raymond, Rem. [A]; and Nouvelles de Repub. des lettres Janvier, 1685, p. 15. but above all the preface to Wake's expoſition of the doctrine of the church of England, in anſwer to it. Had the reſpectable Eſſayiſt read the article *Pienne* in Bayle's Dictionary, he would, I am perſuaded, have ſpared his reflection upon Luther, and the Landgrave of Heſſe. Mr. Bayle has been thought, in moderating between the proteſtants and the papiſts, to have carried his candour in favour of the latter oftentimes to exceſs. But on this laſt mentioned occaſion he finds himſelf obliged to ſay, " Nothing appeared ſhameful to Paul IV, provided he might find " pretences not to annull the marriage of Mr. Montmorancy." Rem. [D] at the end. But this gentleman ſeems to have taken the biſhop of Meaux's word in the groſs both for his account of the variations among the proteſtants, and the ſolidity of the argument he grounds upon it. Whereas nothing could be more ridiculous and impertinent than the biſhop's reaſoning, while ſo many va-

"bation?" It is hardly time for him yet, whatever it may be hereafter, to laugh in your face, and tell you he only meant to throw a little dust in your eyes, till an opportunity could be met with to shew you the difference.

II. The catholic principle of intolerance comes next under our consideration. And there can be very little doubt of the apologist's entire affection to it, when it is considered from what a venerable original he derives it, even from the Jews, for whose conduct towards Christ and his apostles, he very handsomely apologizes, by telling us, that the christian doctrines "were novel notions to the Jews— "they were fully persuaded it was incumbent "upon them to oppose all innovations; and it "must be allowed, under such a deception of "appearances, that there was some shadow of "reason to plead for their exerting themselves "in the way they did. This therefore," says he, "is all that can be said to extenuate the "crime of persecution in the carnal Jews."

All that can be said! what can the man mean? Is it possible he should not think this sufficient, not only to extenuate but even to justify this intolerance of the jewish church, when we find him concluding his apology for it in these justificative words: "for as no in- "terior conviction wrought so prevalently as

riations in the syſtem of popery were upon record, and particularly ſo many innovations ſince the church of Rome pretended to infallibility. See *Baſnage, Hiſt. de la Rel. des Egliſes Reformées*, Tom. V. Edit. 12mo. 1721. If this gentleman, by his examples, can clear the church of Rome from this manifeſt occaſion of recrimination, he will then give his readers a good reaſon why he refers them to France, Holland, and England, for examples of immoral tendency, rather than to the kingdoms of Fez and Morocco, or to the country of the Hottentots about the Cape of Good Hope.

"to make them judge that their law ought to "be abrogated, we cannot be much surprised "to find them so tenacious of every thing be- "longing to it, and so vigilant in guarding "against whatever might be hurtful to its "preservation." *Apol.* p. 4.

The plain english of which is, that the Jews having *no interior conviction* that they were in the wrong, all that they did against Christ and his apostles was very justifiable; *nobody can be surprised at it*, because it proceeded from an interior conviction that they were in the right. The consequence of which is, that every church which is infallibly in the right, ought to suppress and persecute all who oppose her, as the Jews did by Christ and his apostles. It is to no purpose to object, that Christ and his apostles alledged the authority of the scriptures for their doctrines, that the jews had these in their hands, and ought to have examined them: all this wrought no interior conviction; and, while that was the case, we cannot be much surprised, according to our apologist, that they did what they did to Christ and his apostles, as that was only a necessary vigilance in guarding against whatever might be hurtful to the preservation of their law. They had an interior conviction that they were in the right, and that was sufficient.

And upon this ground he builds the intolerance of the Romish church; for his whole apology turns upon the supposition that the church of Rome has ever been in the right since the times of the apostles; that she alone hath had the power of interpreting scripture, and defining points of faith, and alone hath

just authority for this purpose. The consequence is, that every one who contradicts her is an heretic, and every one who separates from her a schismatic. And, having thus begged his premises, he concludes, p. 41, that *nothing can justify schism, nothing can palliate, much less excuse, the offence of shaking off just authority.*

Hence he infers the rectitude of establishing the inquisition for the suppression of the Albigenses; and he thinks, that, taking it for granted that the Albigenses were what he represents them to be, the protestants even of these days must agree that the inquisition was a very proper method of dealing with them, "and a ne-"cessary and a justifiable measure," p. 20.

I will not pretend to say what may be the sentiments of the protestant company this apologist may keep, nor will I presume to contradict the inferences he may draw from propositions that are to be found in books of no long standing, written by authors who call themselves protestants. In every christian society there will be mistaken and wrong-headed men, not sufficiently instructed in the principles of their religion. In every protestant church or society since the reformation, there have been men violently prejudiced in favour of their respective establishments, and sufficiently hot and eager in defence of them, to desire to distress their fellow-protestants who do not think as they do. These, however, are spots and blemishes in whatever protestant church they are found; and, in respect of our own constitution, betray a spirit, which both the lenity of our civil government, and the

original principles of the protestant church of England do most expressly condemn.

But this I will say, that they must be strange protestants indeed, who, taking this apologist's account of the Albigenses all together, will venture to agree with him that the institution of the inquisition, for their correction and punishment, was *a necessary and justifiable measure!*

For he is obliged to acknowledge, p. 18, that there were among the Albigenses "men who "led an austere and regular life, declaring an "utter aversion against lies and swearing." Did the inquisition make any difference between these and others of looser moral principles? By no means. He has not the assurance to assert it. Heresy and schism then were the only crimes of which, with respect to these good men, the inquisition took cognisance.*

* The Apologist labours hard to fix the heresy of the *Manichæans* upon the *Albigenses*, upon the credit of such writers as *Bossuet*, *Sanders*, *Baronius*, and *Spondanus*, whom in his justificative piece, he dignifies with the title of the *best writers*, though some of the really best writers of his own communion have been in many instances ashamed of them. The truth is, the Apologist hath neither done himself nor his readers common justice in this representation. He could hardly be ignorant that the celebrated Basnage hath fully confuted the bishop of Meaux upon this head of accusation, by the testimony of writers of the best authority among the roman catholics themselves; namely, *Du Tillet*, *De Serres*, *Vignier*, and *Guillame de Puy-Laurens*. *Basnage* observes, that the bishop of Meaux takes care not to make the least mention of this last writer, "fearing that all his labour should be lost, and all the "vast collection he had made from so many authors, with a view to "suffocate us with their number, should become useless, if he had "intimated by the least citation that there was such an author in "being" [as Guillame de Puy Laurens]. *Hist. De la Rel. des Engl. Reform*, vol. I. p, 239. In another place, Mr. Basnage observes, that "a monk, named *Pierre des Vallees de Cernay*, is

And upon this footing the inquisition is equally justifiable at this moment as it was at its first institution. And if there are any protestants so called who think the inquisition a justifiable measure in this view, it is but justice to the rest that he should name them, on the peril, if he does not, of being held a slanderous calumniator.

After this, who will pay the least regard to his canting pretensions to the moderation and charitable forbearance of the church of Rome? If nothing can justify schism, nothing ought to screen or protect schismatics from inquisitorial punishment; and the church of Rome having no interior conviction that she is in the wrong, or, in other words, having interior conviction that she is infallible, it is impossible she should ever esteem herself to be mistaken in the proper objects of her punishments, which must therefore be all whom she judges to be heretics or schismatics; for both come under the same predicament. Heretics, refu-

" the principal author upon whose authority *Mr. De Meaux* imputes " *Manicheism* to the Albigenses, who nevertheless is convicted of " falsehood by the most credible historians," p. 243. of which indeed Mr. Basnage brings abundant proof in the 9th and tenth chapters of this first volume. In one word, it appears, by the testimony of *Du Tillet* and *De Serres*, that the tenets of the Albigenses were those and those only of the first reformers. " The reasons of their " separation from the church" (says *De Serres*, from an authentic record) " perfectly resembled those which were revived by Wick- " liffe and Luther. For they would not receive the authority of the " Pope, nor acknowledge him for universal bishop. They rejected " images, purgatory, the merit of works, indulgences, pilgrimages, " vows, the celibate of priests, the invocation of saints, and traffick- " ing in things consecrated." And for the suppression of these and the like heresies, respecting the doctrines and the authority of the see of Rome, and such only, was the inquisition instituted.

sing to be determined by the doctrinal decisions of the church, shake off just authority, equally with schismatics, and are equally unjustifiable and inexcuseable.

But here the respectable author of *Thoughts, Essays*, and *Maxims*, &c. presents us with a most remarkable variegation. The *Apologist*, as we have seen, grounds the inquisitorial right of persecuting on the infallibility of the church. "But, says Mr. H. persecution in a roman "catholic must be wrong, *because* he asserts "his church to be infallible, therefore all force "or persecution to support it by undue influ- "ence or interest is superfluous, and tends "only to compel men to profess what they do "not believe." It is not easy to comprehend what the gentleman means. He could hardly intend to banter his own church on her groundless pretension to infallibility. And yet his argument may seem to have this tendency. "Persecution and force in an infallible church "is superfluous," says he. Why so? The proper answer is "because such a church is "and must be sufficiently supported by its "own infallibility, and cannot be shaken or "hurt by heretics or gainsayers of any kind. "It must stand and flourish at all events." This indeed is talking as would become a church conscious that her claim to infallibility was incontestable, and evident to the whole world. But this gentleman must be very imperfectly instructed in the principles of his own church, if he really thinks that she proceeds upon this presumption. The apologist would have informed him better. The idea of an infallible church, according to him, implies not

only an authority, but a duty to punish schismatics, and those who offend by shaking off her just authority. These offences cannot be justified, palliated, or excused; and the infallible church which should overlook them must be highly blameable for suffering these enormous crimes to come off with impunity; inasmuch as, being infallible, it is impossible she should mistake either in the guilt of the objects, or the degree of punishment due to that guilt.

So that what the respectable writer of the *Thoughts, Essays*, &c. adds, *viz.* that "force "and persecution tend only to make men pro- "fess what they do not believe,—to become "hypocrites, sacrilegious," &c. is of no kind of weight against the Apologist's state of the case. For a man had better, according to the Apologist, be an hypocrite, a sacrilegious partaker of holy rites, or in short any thing whatever, than a schismatic. An hypocrite, or a sacrilegious person, bad as he may be, while he communicates with the church, is no schismatic,—does not shake off the church's just authority; and, for ought that appears in the apology, while this is the case, the hypocrisy, or the sacrilege of the conformist may be palliated, excused, or even justified.

Thus these gentlemen, by dodging backwards and forwards, think fit to amuse us into a temporary persuasion, that intolerance is not the principle of their church; and, to make this pass the more smoothly, they have affected to appeal to the practice of protestant churches. Where there are matters of fact to justify this appeal, it gives us concern; but we desire they will take notice that they are

but matters of fact; practices which are no otherwise to be justified but upon popish principles, which all intelligent, sincere, and consistent protestants utterly detest and abhor.

But, *in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird*, especially of a bird which hath often *escaped the snare of the fowler*. It is a contemptible affectation in such writers as the Apologist, to talk of charity and forbearance in the church of Rome, at the same time that he hath shewn, by exposing her foundations, that, in all probability, unlimited charity and forbearance, with the free and fearless exertion of the reasoning faculty, enlightened by scripture-evidence, would not have left her one subject, such only excepted as *by her craft have had their wealth.*

However, it must be owned, these gentlemen write after a copy of sufficient dignity to keep them in countenance. The following citation will explain my meaning, and may serve for a seasonable caution to british protestants, not to pay the least regard to these strains of lenity and forbearance from writers of this complexion.

"The maxim that he [King James II] set "up, and about which he entertained all about "him, was the great happiness of an universal "toleration. On this the king used to enlarge "in a great variety of topics. He said, *nothing* "*was more reasonable, more christian, more* "*politic; and he reflected much on the church* "*of* England *for the severities with which* "*the dissenters had been treated.* This, how "true or just soever it might be, yet was strange "doctrine in the mouth of a *professed papist*,

" and of a prince on whose account and by " whose direction the church-party had been " indeed but too obsequiously pushed on to " that rigour." Bishop Burnet's *Hist. of his Own Times*, fol. vol. I. p. 672.

If it should be asked, how King James II, or any other papist, could reconcile these professions to doctrines and practices so directly contrary to them, the same worthy prelate hath taught us in another work, how to account for this.

" The *extirpation of heretics*, and the *breach* " *of faith to them*, have been decreed by two " of their general councils, and by a tradi- " tion of several ages:—Now these opinions, " as they have never been renounced by the " body of that church, so indeed they cannot " be, unless they renounce their infallibility, " which is their basis, at the same time. There- " fore, though a prince of that communion " may very sincerely resolve to maintain li- " berty of conscience, and to keep his word, " yet the blind subjection, into which he is " brought by his religion, to his church, must " force him to break through all that, as soon " as the doctrine of his church is opened to " him, and that absolution is denied him, or " higher threatenings are made him, if he con- " tinues firm to his merciful inclinations." *Reflections on a pamphlet entitled, Parliamentum Pacificum, in the IId vol. of Bishop Burnet's Tracts*, 4to, p. 68.

Thus we may argue with respect to this apologist. Suppose him to be an honest, sincere, and merciful man in himself, and really to mean what he professes in favour of toleration,

yet he may not have had all the doctrines of his church opened to him; and his justificative piece seems to afford a presumption that he must retract some things in his apology in order to intitle himself to absolution. So that, as I said, supposing him to be sincere in his own professions, opinions, and dispositions in favour of religious liberty, these can be nothing to us, unless his church would confirm them by a solemn act, repealing her former decisions, so contrary to them.

I am sorry, however, to observe that the apologist hath left us too much room to question his sincerity. The honourable author of *Thoughts*, &c. appears, by some little tokens, not to have had the doctrines of his church sufficiently opened to him, as in the instance of his bringing the infallibility of the church of Rome, as an argument why she should not persecute; and therefore his opinion of the iniquity of persecution may proceed from the disposition of his own generous mind, and the light in which he hath hitherto considered these things, abstracted from the intervention of the church. Not so the apologist, who plainly appears to be aware of all the consequences of admitting the infallibility of the church of Rome; to argue all along upon the supposition or rather the assurance, that it is real and indisputable; and in consequence of that, amidst all his cant about charity and forbearance, laying down principles utterly inconsistent with all possibility of an infallible church's admitting of toleration.

Having these testimonies even from the roman catholics of the present day, that these

pernicious principles, of *a foreign jurisdiction, superior to that of the civil government of Great Britain, and of the absolute inconsistency of all toleration with the authority of an infallible church*, are still among the leading maxims of that sect, the legislature of Great Britain, the patrons and protectors of our protestant settlement civil and religious, are fully justified in excluding papists from all those privileges to which those citizens are intitled, who acknowlege the supremacy of the civil powers in all the departments of government, and on that foundation pledge their faith and allegiance to them.

But when to these pernicious persuasions of the papists we add, in the last place, their indefatigable zeal and industry in making proselytes to their church; that is, in other words, in seducing his Majesty's subjects from their allegiance; the justification of our civil governors, in providing penal laws against these disturbers of public peace and order, is complete and irrefragable.

III. And this is the third particular which remains to be explained, and in which we shall still take this apologist for our interpreter; and begin with citing a passage from him, not a little remarkable in a writer in his circumstances.

"There is," says he, "still another objec-
"tion which deserves examination. It may
"be alledged that, if a toleration was granted
"to catholics, it would be a means to spirit
"up their clergy to make converts; whereas,
"as things now stand, being overawed by
"penal laws, they are afraid to engage in such
"pursuits." To which the apologist makes the

following curious answer: "I verily believe "that more conversions are made by catholics "under persecution, than there would be if "they were exempted from that apprehension. "Suffered to live unpersecuted, they would "be more moderate in attempts of this kind; "they would be careful not to give any um- "brage to the government: but persecuted, "they must naturally be supposed to exert "themselves in strengthening their party, in "collecting force from the rigour of opposi- "tion, and in manning their hearts with for- "tude, notwithstanding the prospect of punish- "ment." *Apology*, p. 117, 118.

By *catholics persecuted*, the apologist means, catholics under the restraint of penal laws; that is to say, catholics in the same circumstances with the catholics in Great Britain and Ireland. These catholics, he admits, make converts, and he is not shy in telling us on what account? namely, *to strengthen their party—to collect force*—and *to man their hearts with fortitude*. Would you know to what end? This he likewise discovers, at page 106. "For "though at present they have no sufficient "force to think of making opposition—yet the "advice is always good, and *may* be support- "ed from several testimonies of history, that "no enemy whatever ought to be held in a "contemptible light, as some time or other he "may find an opportunity to retaliate, and "obey the dictates of REVENGE.*

* This saucy menace goes on thus: "The British and Irish ca- "tholics, though helpless in themselves, claim a fraternity with "many other respectable bodies of men throughout Europe, who "doubtless would resent their farther ill treatment." It has often been said, that the papists of Great Britain and Ireland have been

Revenge! for what, and upon whom? Revenge taken upon our gracious sovereign and the members and ministers of his government, for suffering a dirty, malicious, and abusive scribbler to insult and menace them in this audacious manner with impunity? Can this be the language of men under persecution? Can they, who dare thus to brave the government under whose protection they live, be under any necessity to make converts to man their hearts with fortitude? Can this be the language of men under any kind of distress, or under any the least degree of apprehension of it? For my part, I verily think the most respectable among the roman catholics must be ashamed of their apologist in this instance at least; nor should I be at all surprized to hear, that these passages were among the first of those which laid the apologist under the necessity of writing his justificative piece.

Let us now look back to the alternative. "Suffered to live unpersecuted, they would "be more moderate in attempts of this kind, "they would be careful not to give any um-"brage to the government." So then the ca-

and ſtill are in a perpetual league and amity with the roman catholic powers in different parts of Europe, even when they were at war with us. But none of them ever had the front, before this apologiſt, to avow this claim of fraternity in all circumſtances. It has, by the prudent part of them, been inſtriouſly concealed, and even denied, in times of war. But now we are informed that this reſentment of theſe foreign fraternities remains, even at thoſe times when no war ſubſiſts between them and the Britiſh ſtate. May not this point at ſome preſent expectations the apologiſt may have of rouzing theſe fraternities to take a part in the revenge he hath in proſpect, eſpecially if the holy Father ſhould lend his hand "to unite their "power and arms, to guard the faith, from the attempts of its na-"tural enemies?"

tholics act in this affair of proselyting entirely upon political considerations. And yet is not this the very thing which in another place he most strenuously denies? "Protestants," says he, "think it very heinous that catholics should "say, there is no saving faith but their own, "and that all out of the pale of their church "are damned." *Apology*, p. 26. And this sentence, it seems, the protestants think so heinous and uncharitable, that "they fancy, "to mollify it, that the assertion must be "merely political, in order to retain catholics in "their own communion, or gain over prose-"lytes: but indeed it is quite the reverse," says the apologist, "being built upon such irrefra-"gable conclusions drawn from scripture "doctrine, that it [the sentence] cannot be "contested." P. 29. According to this account, the zeal of the roman catholics in making proselytes is the pure effect of conscience and charity, for the salvation of souls. But, according to the other, their zeal in making proselytes is entirely a political affair, merely to collect force, and to strengthen their party. Suffer them to live unpersecuted, and their attempts of this sort will be more moderate, and conscience and charity will readily give way to their care not to give umbrage to government.

Let us not, however, be suprized at this. It is only of a piece with his representing the roman catholics of Great Britain and Ireland as in a state of persecution, even after he had said in his preface, p. vi, "The catholics have "long enjoyed the lenity of the government, "and are thankful for it; and, as their in-

" tention is no other than to demean them-
" selves as good subjects, they hope for a
" continuance of the same benevolent dis-
" position."

Take the matter then which way you will; papists *will*, and *judge* they *ought* to make proselytes among protestants at all events. In a state of persecution, they think it good policy, in order to *collect force*, and to *strengthen their party*, that they may, in process of time, be powerful enough to revenge themselves upon those who oppose them. In other circumstances, it is a matter of charity and conscience; in other words, an indispensable duty; and accordingly, " no church " has exhibited more illustrious specimens of " charity than the catholic, in willing the " conversion of all sinners, jews, mahomme-" dans, pagans, heretics, and schismatics; and " in not barely willing, but ardently praying " and endeavouring for the same.—Who," says " the apologist, " have taken more painful " journies, or endured greater hardships, as " missionaries, to convert infidels [the natu-" ral enemies of the roman faith,] at the " hazard of their lives?" P. 26.

In perusing this apology when it first appeared, I could not help thinking it must be the work of some conceited overweening jesuit, who, having made some converts among us by the artifices natural to that tribe, became so exalted upon his success, as to imagine he had nothing to do but to publish his sentiments in order to captivate the whole nation at once, and bring them over not only to vote for a full toleration of popery, but even to establish

it once more as the national religion. He seems to rely much on the supineness and "indolent disposition of the established clergy, "to instruct their flock and keep them to "their duty," p. 118; and, I dare say, takes it for granted, that both clergy and people are so sunk in ignorance of the religious part of the controversy, and so wholly careless and inattentive with respect to the political, that he might venture to put any thing upon them; and that a little plausible gilding would easily prevail with them to swallow it.

Could a man with a less degree of confidence and presumption, even with an equestrian pedigree as long as Cadwallader's, have had the effrontery to talk of "a scheme he hath long "thought of, and purposes some time or other "to make public, for effecting a salutary union "between the church of Rome and the established church of England," impudently suggesting "that the church of England agrees "in almost all the fundamentals and essentials "of faith with his sort of catholics?" *Apol.* p. 119, 120.*

* This was perhaps something more than a pretence in *Leander* when, in the year 1635, he gave Cardinal *Barberino* an account of the several fundamentals and essentials in which the church of England agreed with the church of Rome. *State Papers collected by Edward Earl of Clarendon*, p. 197. I shall say nothing to the particulars enumerated by Leander, farther than to observe, that whatever protestant company this more modern apologist may keep, or from whomsoever he had this account of agreement in fundamentals, &c. he was, without peradventure, misinformed. Leander, after he had mentioned several circumstances in which the church of England of that time agreed with the church of Rome, says; "Absque "hâc Hierarchici regiminis formâ, existimant nostrates in Anglia "Protestantes, non solum obscurari decus Ecclesiæ Christianæ, verum "etiam ipsam ejus naturam & substantiam tolli. Quapropter reli-

Thus the apologist hath saved us the trouble of proving that the papists are as obnoxious as ever to our protestant government, on account of their indefatigable zeal in seducing his majesty's subjects to the belief of the church of Rome's infallibility, and consequently to all the pernicious doctrines (pernicious to their plighted allegiance to their rightful sovereign, as well as to their spiritual allegiance to Christ, who hath made them free from this yoke of bondage) depending upon it. He not only acknowledges and glories in the fact, but accounts for their success in their conversions from circumstances highly reflecting on, and, I would hope, highly injurious to, the respectable clergy of the established church; which those protestant writers, who have represented the late complaints of the increase of popery among us as the effect of groundless clamour, and sinister views, rather than of any real conviction of the matter of fact, would do well to consider.

How the case really stands with respect to

" quas Eccleſias proteſtantium per Europam ſparſas, quoniam hanc " antiquiſſimam Hierarchiam repudiârunt, & averſantur, revera " habent in numero ſchiſmaticorum." However this might be in the days of Leander, it is, I will venture to ſay, far from being the caſe with the proteſtants of the church of England at this time. Where did this apologiſt learn, that the church of England, as now conſtituted, holds the foreign proteſtant churches, who diſſent from her form of hierarchical government, as ſchiſmatics, or as perſons who, by ſuch diſſent, obſcure and even take away the nature and ſubſtance of a chriſtian church? And how, without ſome authentic evidence to this purpoſe, will the apologiſt be able to prove this agreement of the two churches in fundamentals and eſſentials? See *the Life of Biſhop Kennet*, p. 111—127. One might appeal to authorities leſs moderate in church matters than biſhop Kennet, and even to ſome mentioned by the apologiſt himſelf.

the numbers converted to popery of late years, I will not pretend to pronounce. Intelligence of this kind may probably be had, in no long time, from the highest authority in the kingdom. But this I will venture to say, upon the testimony of this apology, and some other late performances from the same quarter, and penned in the same spirit, that in no period since the revolution hath popery appeared so open and barefaced, and with such audacious insults and abuses of the protestant reformation, as within the compass of the last two or three years. And, if this increased confidence of the papists is not to be ascribed to their increased numbers, I am afraid we shall be driven to account for it by circumstances still more alarming to the real friends of our protestant settlement, and to the religious and civil liberties of this country, which must stand or fall with it.

Perhaps a cursory view of the management of our apologist may give us a little light into one of these circumstances at least.

In his *Apology* he makes it his business to trim as dextrously as he can, between the papists and the protestants, upon what he calls "two capital points: first, the attachment of "the papists to the banished Stuart family; "secondly, their acknowledgement of a power "in the pope, which is inconsistent with the "laws of this realm." *Apol.* p. 107.

In a little time, however, that is to say, in as little a time as his fraternity could take in reading and judging of the contents of his pamphlet we find the writer under a necessity of sending after his apology a *justificative*

piece; the occasion of which is pretended to be, that "the catholic nobility of this realm "have expressed great displeasure that an ob- "scure author should presume to make an "*apology* for them, being fully sufficient "themselves, if they found it needful, to pe- "tition in a body his majesty and his parlia- "ment for a mitigation of grievances," p. 176.

It is natural here to ask, why the roman catholic nobility did not express their displeasure against some other late advocates for the mitigation of their grievances, who, for aught the public knew of them, were equally obscure with our apologist? And then again, if the roman catholic nobility were displeased with the apology, solely on the account of the obscurity of the author, that objection seems to have been sufficiently obviated by the very honourable pedigree the apologist hath exhibited, by which he seems to set himself on a level with the best blood, catholic or protestant, in the kingdom. What occasion to extend his justification to any other topics, if the forward officiousness of an obscure writer had been the only objection to this apologist?

The very nature of the case then leads us to suspect that the displeased roman catholics had some cause to be discontented with the apology, besides the obscurity of the writer; and the principal subject of the justificative piece points out, even with certainty, the cause of offence.

He had played his part, it seems, on the subject of the pontifical powers, with sufficient skill and artifice to amuse the protestants with what he appeared to give up, at the same time that he saved the honour and obligation of the

roman catholics, by the extensive advantages he still reserved to his holiness.

But when he came to touch upon the attachment of the roman catholics to the house of Stuart, the poor gentleman had worse luck, and undertook a little too hastily, that "the "British and Irish catholics have long been "disused to consider, with high-churchmen, "as things not to be contested, the notions of "hereditary and inalienable right, divine right, "passive obedience and non-resistance." Apol. p. 107.

The British and Irish roman catholics could not but be sensible that the high-churchmen must take it grievously amiss, that they were thus left in the lurch by those upon whose natural attachment to the Stuart family they had the greatest reason to rely. Some of these high-churchmen too might be too considerable to be thus deserted by those who had continued to give them assurances all along of their being prepared to assist upon all exigencies. And as the justificative piece is almost wholly taken up in making the best of this mistake, we learn from it, that the obscurity of the author was far from being the only reason that offence and displeasure was taken at the apologist by the British and Irish catholics.

Let us now see with what grace and dexterity he makes the *amende honorable* in his justificative piece. In his apology above quoted, he represents the British and Irish catholics as being convinced that the notion of divine hereditary right was no longer defensible, and consequently that they had laid it aside upon principle and conviction that the British par-

liament had a right to dispose of the crown first to King William, and afterwards to the house of Hanover. But finding, by the displeasure of the english catholics, that he had herein engaged for more than he could make good, he endeavours to come off by intimating that if they had not disused themselves to consider the notion of the hereditary and unalienable right of the house of Stuart as incontestable upon principle, they ought to have done it in good policy.

"He has not," he says, "in the least any "view to cast the least odium upon the house "of Stuart. The name deserves to be revered, "were it for no other reason than its mingling "with the blood of the most illustrious potentates of Europe,"—p. 185. "From whence" he says, "the intention of the author [of the "Apology] has been all along plain and obvious, being calculated to demonstrate, that, "upon an unprejudiced review of all circumstances, it is much more adviseable for the "catholics to covet subjection to the house "of Hanover, as by law established, even in a "state of persecution, than to the house of "Stuart.—And of this," he tells us, "all the "catholics, whether British or Irish, seem now "conscious to themselves, *not because their "hopes of a popish pretender are extinguished*, "but because they clearly see the tranquillity "of undisturbed life connected with it. For "indeed," continues he, "if any are so fanciful as to foster the hopes of a pretender, "they may still do it as much as ever. It "appears by M'Allester's letters, not long "since published, that the pretender, though

"apparently disavowed by France, was the "animating spring last war of all their secret "schemes against England." *Justificative Piece*, p. 186.

By this detail it is clear he found that the consciences of the English and Irish catholics were not so pliable on this head, of the divine hereditary right of the house of Stuart, as he had pretended. It is probable they gave him to understand, that, after all his flourishes in the apology, the British and Irish catholics, where the divine right intervened, had no better opinion of a parliamentary head of the state, than of a parliamentary head of the church. He was obliged, therefore, to compromise matters with them, to leave them their veneration for the house of Stuart undisturbed; to grant that their hopes of a popish pretender might not be extinguished, that they might still foster those hopes; for that the French (one of those respectable bodies of men with whom the papists of Great Britain and Ireland claim a fraternity,) though they apparently disavowed the pretender, yet made use of him during the last war as the animating spring of all their secret schemes against England. His intention, therefore, he tells them, was only to suggest to them what was adviseable in the present exigency—that he took the hint from their seeming acquiescence and tranquillity under the present government, and consequently might be excuseable in supposing that this might proceed from a consciousness that the title of the house of Hanover was preferable to that of the house of Stuart.

What effect this dodging justification may

have towards procuring absolution for this apologist, one cannot say, nor probably shall we ever know. But I must own I am far from thinking it will give satisfaction to our *jure-divino* high-churchmen. For that circumstance of a seeming consciousness of the expediency of subjection to the house of Hanover in the British and Irish papists, may naturally enough suggest a jealousy in the said high-churchmen, that these their ancient allies are meditating a defection from their common principle, unless the roman catholics can convince them that the apologist is wholly uncommissioned to declare their sense upon this delicate article, and that he hath actually been put to his penance for this presumption.

In the mean time we are let into an interesting secret; namely, that the body of the roman catholics of Great Britain and Ireland remain still unsatisfied with the parliamentary title of the house of Hanover. Why else is this point so much laboured by this writer in his justificative piece, after his repeated endeavours to adjust it to the taste of those catholics in his Apology? Nor indeed is this all we learn. The Justificative Piece informs us, that the Apologist's fellow-catholics are in no disposition to forego their hopes of the restoration of a popish pretender; and that, whatever countenance the French may occasionally put on, they may, at the bottom, be depended upon whenever the pretender may be made use of to promote their secret schemes upon England. —And indeed, suppose the French not to be in earnest with respect to any real design of advancing the pretender to the British throne,

what are we to judge of their making this occasional use of him? Of himself he hath no power, no forces, no money to pay them, which are all necessary articles to make him a valuable ally to the French. The alternative is, that he hath a strong party among the papists and high-churchmen in England, who, while they can be amused with hopes that the pretender's interests are forwarding, will readily concur with the French, or any other fraternal power in Europe, in their secret schemes against the present government of this country.

I will not inquire how far the apologist himself may or may not be in earnest in giving this detail of his political principles, or how sincere he may be in ascribing to the British legislature the sole power of disposing of the British crown. He hath sufficiently discovered that the British and Irish catholics in general do not think as he pretends to do; and he hath dropped one intimation, that they will never quit the hope that some pretender may one day relieve their distresses.

"Hope," says he, "how vain soever, is the "last smiling solace that quits a man, before "he resigns his breath. As a balsam to his "woes, he will figure to himself that the hand "which was the cause of his being depressed, "might again be instrumental towards lifting "him up: so that a pretender will never be "wanting to those who chuse to create one, "though every one of the house of Stuart "was as extinct in life as in law to the people "of Great Britain and Ireland." *Justif. Piece*, p. 186, 187.

It is not easy to understand how they who hope that the hand which was the cause of the roman catholics being depressed, if the hand of a Stuart is here meant, should be again instrumental in lifting them up, notwithstanding every one of the house of Stuart should be extinct. Undoubtedly this is meant of the British and Irish papists, of whose depression one or more of the house of Stuart was certainly the cause. But, if the whole house of Stuart were utterly extinct, how is it possible the same hand should be instrumental in lifting them up, which was the cause of depressing them? That the British and Irish catholics would never be without a popish pretender to oppose to a protestant sovereign, is credible enough; but it is neither kind nor politic in the apologist to be so forward to apprise us of this disposition in the faithful, even though this intelligence might be in some measure necessary to his justification. The roman catholics and the high-churchmen, who are attached to the pretender's title, alledge a reason of conscience for it; and while we can suppose them sincere, we have compassion for their being misled into so many inconveniences by a false principle, at the same time that we are obliged to restrain them from doing mischief with it. But if, as the apologist represents them, they will have a pretender at all adventures, whether a Stuart or not, we are sure that conscience can have nothing to do in a determination of that sort; and, if there was no other reason to be thought of, that alone would be sufficient to exclude such desperadoes from any toleration in a free protestant government.*

* It is remarkable that, while some of the *Apologist's* sort of high-

Upon the whole, had not this *Justificative Piece* followed so close upon the heels of the *Apology*, I should have been inclined to come over to the opinion of those who have conjectured that the Apology was the work of some determined enemy to the roman catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, who thought fit to expose them to the resentment and contempt of the english protestants, by offering so many gross affronts to their national establishment, and advancing so many absurdities and contradictions on the behalf of his own pretended party. The Justificative Piece leaves no farther room for these surmises. The obscurity of the author hath not prevented his being discovered by the roman catholics, who have, with good reason, expressed their displeasure at the folly and presumption of a private man of their own persuasion thus taking upon him, without any commission, to answer for the whole body in points which so nearly concern the connexion and consistency of their whole system. And now that the apologist hath presented us

churchmen have been embellishing their *idol-adventurer* in the public prints with every human virtue, and reproaching the pope for treating him with so little respect to the character he assumes, the popish pleaders for toleration have been as diligent in assuring us of his insignificance; perfectly ridiculing his pretensions to regal honours without the countenance of his holiness, which, it seems, he is no longer to expect. They who remember in what style the roman catholics talked in the father's life time, are much surprised at this sudden turn. But others (some of whom pretend to have made observations on the spot) think all this very accountable. "The romans, say they, have been convinced for some time, that considering the slender personal merit of the elder brother, and the devotional attachments of the younger, there is no probability that this branch of the house of Stuart will be farther propagated. So far therefore as the conquest over the northern heresy may be sup-

with so respectable and brilliant an account of his family, he connot long be concealed from any one who has the curiosity to inquire after him.

Some people, I find, have thought, since the publication of the Justificative Piece, that the discovery of the writer of the Apology might answer a more important end than barely gratifying the curiosity of some particular persons. "It is plain, say they, from this attempt to "justify himself, that he hath had no coun-

" posed to depend upon these two brothers, the prospect must be " extremely short and indistinct. On which consideration, it is " conjectured, the roman system with respect to Great Britain and " Ireland hath undergone a revolution; and that, passing by the " pretensions of their present inmates, on account of the defect in " their genealogy, the romans are now looking forward to a catho- " lic pretender beyond them. History informs us, that, in the " year 1701, the Duchess of Savoy tendered a protestation, by " the hands of Count Maffei, against the bill for the Hanover suc- " cession, then depending in parliament; in which, taking no " notice of the late Chevalier, she claimed immediately after the then " Princess Anne of Denmark, *and thereby*, says one of our histo- " rians, *appeared to confirm the just suspicions of that pretender's* " *birth.* *Tindal, Contin. of Rapin*, 8vo, 1758, vol. III. p. 95. " This incident the court of Rome is now supposed to have in its " eye; and, as the roman catholics of this country have always " taken their political cue from thence, it is probable enough that " the strain in which they have lately talked, may be the effect of " the fresh intelligence they have received from that quarter. In " the mean time, though the high churchmen may not have been so " early apprized of this alteration, there is little doubt of their closing " with it, as they may be furnished from history with an instance " where their forefathers were disposed to make a like transfer of " their loyalty, upon certain conditions. *Some of them*, according " to Lamberti, *came to the Count de Briancon, and proposed to* " *him, that the Duke of Savoy should deliver up one of his sons to* " *to be educated in England in the protestant religion; declar-* " *ing that, in that case, the act for the Hanover succession should* " *never pass. But the Duke refused to consent to it.* *Tindal,* " *u. s.* p. 94. There are, besides this, other considerations tend-

" tenance from the roman catholics; but is it " possible a man should have the impudence to " propose to an established protestant church " a scheme of union with the church of Rome, " without some countenance or encourage- " ment from some other quarter? And might " it not be of some use to the public to di-co- " ver the man, for the sake of learning what " are his connexions, and what company he " keeps of another sort?"

" ing to diſpoſe both roman catholics and *Jure-divino* men to ac- " quieſce in the ſuppoſed deciſion of the roman court. They may " both cultivate their new connexions with leſs ſuſpicion, and, what " is of more immediate conſequence to their preſent emolument, " both will undoubtedly be relieved from the burden of certain con- " tributions which muſt on many occaſions have embarraſſed their " private affairs. For the holy congregation, having once canoni- " cally determined againſt the legitimacy of the preſent claimant, " though charity and compaſſion may incline the romans and others " to ſupport him with a decent, and even honourable proviſion, on " account of his relation to a perſon ſo highly diſtinguiſhed by them " as the father, yet there can be no obligation upon them to con- " tinue princely appointments to the ſon, whom upon their receiving " new lights, with reſpect to the foundation of his pretenſions, they " no longer judge to have any juſt demand of that kind upon them." Thus far ſome of our travelling politicians, whoſe ſurmiſes on this head muſt be left to time to falſify or confirm, as it ſhall happen. It often falls out, however, that ſpeculations of this kind, wild and extravagant as they may appear to ſome, are attended, with facts and circumſtances, not otherwiſe out of the common courſe of things, which give them an air of high probability. Some late occurrences at home and abroad, which I forbear to mention, becauſe they are under every one's eye, ſeem to be of this ſort, with reſpect to the matter in queſtion. One cannot poſitively ſay, whether our apologiſt might not hint at this new ſcheme, in telling us, *a pretender will never be wanting to thoſe who chuſe to create one.* This looks at leaſt as if his fellow-catholics and their coadjutors have a pretender in contemplation, excluſive of the two brothers. If ſo, no doubt but the apologiſt will be underſtood by the fraternity; to whom a public intimation of that kind cannot be very agreeable, as it may not yet be time to have a ſecret of that importance divulged; in which

For my part, I think this a matrer of no great consequence, at least till the man shall

caſe we may ſhortly expect another Juſtificative Piece, to explain and vindicate the doctrines and aſſertions of the firſt. In peruſing a late account of the manners and cuſtoms of Italy written by Mr. Barretti, I could not help remarking that, though the author is unmercifully ſevere, and ſometimes with very little reaſon, upon Mr. Sharp, he takes not the leaſt notice of Mr. Sharp's account of the pretender's ſuperſtitious bigotry, nor of his intereſting reflection upon it, though the ſaid Mr. Baretti, upon other occaſions, is not ſparing either of his ſarcaſms on the engliſh religion and government, or of his apologies, ſuch as they are, for the moſt abject and ridiculous ſuperſtitions of his countrymen in general. We may be pretty ſure, by theſe circumſtances, that he did not deſert the patronage of the pretender out of compliment to England. Shall we account for his ſilence by ſaying, that he is a Piedmonteſe, and chuſes to adhere to the proteſtation of the Ducheſs of Savoy, even at this late hour? In ſuch a caſe, it will be no wonder that he ſhould not think himſelf concerned for the reputation of the late Chevalier's ſon, whom, I think, he himſelf ſomewhere calls the Pretender, and whom, upon the ſuppoſition above mentioned, he muſt conſider in that light, without any reſpect had to his competition for the britiſh crown with the illuſtrious family in poſſeſſion of it. For my own part, I cannot but hope that Mr. Sharp will at ſome time make his defence againſt this petulant critic. A very ſuperficial reader may ſee he hath laid himſelf open to ſevere retaliation; and a proper expoſtulation upon his remarkable ſilence on a point which hath heretofore made the roman catholics of this country ſo ſore, and on which they might have expected ſome amends from an Italian writer, to whom the object of Mr. Sharpe's reflections could not be wholly unknown, may probably end in a diſcovery that Mr. Baretti, by waving this once intereſting ſubject at this time, did not pay leſs regard to the preſent taſte of his engliſh friends, than they who on former occaſions have exhauſted their rhetoric in encomiums on the late pretender and his family, when they were the faſhionable objects of the predominant paſſion among the papiſts and high churchmen of Great Britain and Ireland. But whatever may be thought of theſe ſpeculations on account of their novelty, I cannot but think them of importance to the public and worthy of an accurate examination. A due attention to the remoteſt circumſtances, even ſuch as are within a bare poſſibility of affecting our invaluable conſtitution, as it depends upon the parliamentary ſettlement

have exhibited his curious scheme of reconciliation. I trust, the protestants of Great Britain and Ireland are in no present disposition to come into any project of union with the church of Rome; and, even though we should suppose the apologist to have concerted his plan with the most bigoted high churchmen in the kingdom, there are particular reasons to believe that the papists in general would have objections to it, which will for ever prevent its admission among them. Nothing, I am persuaded, will satisfy them, but the establishment of their system, with all its despotic pretensions*; and to accomplish this

of the crown, is no more than we owe to our sovereign, ourselves, and our posterity. When matters are come to that pass, that a popish writer hath the impudence to propose an union of the church of England with the church of Rome, with which the see of Rome will have reason to be well pleased and contented, what a train of reflections is suggested to a thinking English protestant? What do these people mean? Do they expect that our gracious king, and his well affected subjects, will come into the proposal? They can hardly be so mad. Is this union then proposed in pursuance of the compromise offered to the the Count *de Briancon*? One cannot tell. Perhaps the apologist may think that the protestant religion of those who made the offer to the Count, and his own scheme of union, may not be materially different the one from the other; and perhaps he may think right. But if he thinks, by his scheme of religious union, to make way for the political project, what must he think of our loyalty to the house of Hanover? It is not to be imagined that such a writer should have the countenance of any one who is able to protect him from the just indignation of an insulted protestant people. But it is just bad enough with us, if he derives his encouragement from any well-grounded observation that the indifference of some, and the unfriendliness of others, who call themselves protestants, to the principles of civil and religious liberty, together with the inattention of still more, to the encroaching and exterminating nature of popery, may leave room for the full impression of his pernicious documents, without the danger of incurring the resentment of the public in any degree.

* "The papists in England must have a king of their own, a pope, "that must do something in our kingdom; therefore there is no rea-

they have been and ever will be at work, and employ all their craft and artifice for that purpose, upon all occasions and opportunities.

I have been assured upon good authority, that none of the popish casuists are of more esteem with the roman catholics of this kingdom than Bellarmine, upon account of the convenience of so many of his solutions to catholics situated in an heretical country. He is indeed their Oracle. But Bellarmine hath inculcated the duty of destroying heretics in the strongest terms; and only dispenses with it in cases where the catholics are *too few* or *too weak* to attempt it.* The advantages therefore that the protestants give to people thus principled, which may contribute either to their strength or the increase of their numbers, are just so many steps towards the destruction of our constitution.

The history of the Polish dissidents could never have been published at a more seasonable time than when the papists are soliciting an enlargement of their civil and religious privileges in this country, on the pretence of their being so few. We there find the roman catholics and

"ſon they ſhould enjoy the ſame privileges" [which the proteſtants in France enjoyed at that time, viz. of bearing office in the ſtate, &c.] *Selden's Table-Talk*, p. 129. The pope ſtill claims the ſame Kingſhip in Great Britain and Ireland as ever, as appears by the publication of the Bull *In cœna domini* every year on Maundy-Thurſday at Rome; a ſhort account of which may be ſeen in *Bower's Hiſt. of the Popes*, vol. VII. p. 465. Will the papiſts of Great Britain and Ireland give us any ſecurity that they diſavow the doctrines of this Bull? or will they chuſe to inſinuate, with the apologiſt, p. 141, that a claim ſolemnly and religiouſly publiſhed annually by all popes, "was only arrogated by ſome popes in former times?"

* *Bellarmine, de Laicis*, lib. III. cap. 22.

dissidents of Poland were once nearly equal as to numbers. We learn from it the stipulations between the two parties, and by what solemn decisions their civil and religious rights were secured to the dissidents upon various occasions; but all to no purpose, when they who called themselves catholics had increased their numbers, and had got the power into their hands. The maxim that *no faith is to be kept with heretics*, was never more visibly nor canonically executed, from the time that it had the sacred sanction of the council of Constance. No artifice, no injustice, no violence was omitted, whereby the dissidents might be dispossessed of their churches, and restrained in the exercise of their religion. And what has happened in the course of the late struggles, by which the dissidents have endeavoured to reinstate themselves in their natural and legal rights and privileges, makes it evident to demonstration, that THE SPIRIT OF POPERY IS STILL THE SAME, irreconcileable in its hatred and enmity to all dissenters from it; bigoted to the most abject superstitions of the darkest ages, and determined against every degree of toleration, wherever it has the power to inforce its sanguinary decrees against those whom it thinks fit to stigmatize with the name of heretics.

After all, though it is impossible to see what security the papists of Great Britain and Ireland can give to a protestant government for their dutiful subjection to it, more especially along with that absolute deference they pay to the pope, if we take it even upon the terms stated by the apologist (in which, it should seem, he has gone far below any authority

he has from his fellow-catholics)—though, I say, it is impossible to see this from any proposals that have been offered by the various writers who have pleaded their cause within the last two or three years, yet, if any means could be found which might insure the public safety against the treasonable, exterminating principles of their religion, and at the same time permit them the free and unmolested exercise of their worship, they would not find an advocate more ready to plead their cause than myself.

Some plans of this kind have not long ago appeared in the newspapers, which might seem to deserve the consideration of the public, if the answers to them, and the remarks upon them by popish writers in the same papers, had not betrayed the utter aversion of the whole party to the necessary limitations there proposed, and indeed to any limitations upon the busy pragmatical spirit of their priests, and other emissaries, ever upon the watch to seize all opportunities of carrying on the grand work of proselyting, and thereby promoting disaffection to our established religion and government, in the prospect of gaining that by power and force, which I trust, they will never be able to compass by treaty and negotiation.

ADDENDUM.

I HAVE at length met with *Arnauld's Apologie pour les catholiques*, where his misrepresentation of Sir Robert Southwell's testimony given at Coleman's trial, appears page 224, and makes a part of his fourth proof of Coleman's innocence. He there not only treats Sir Robert with marks of contempt, calling him "a certain Robert Southwell, &c." but says, that he gave an account of some particulars in Oates's testimony before the council, which Oates himself said he had not given. And, in order to make Sir Robert's evidence appear inconsistent with itself, he totally omits Sir Robert's answer to the Lord Chief Justice's last interrogatory, where Sir Robert fully establishes his own credit, as well as that of Oates, with respect to the particular in question; as may be seen in Coleman's trial, printed in 1678, page 39, 40. As I have not seen that edition of the *Apologie*, in which Sir Robert Southwell's letter to Mr. Arnauld, together with Mr. Arnauld's answer and acknowledgment, are printed, I cannot give the particulars. But what Arnauld's biographer says of this affair is to this effect: "Mr. Arnauld be-
"ing mistaken, in refuting the romance of this
"conspiracy, in a fact, which wounded the
"honour of Sir Robert Southwell, an english

" protestant, some time secretary to the coun-
" cil of his Britannic majesty, he [Arnauld]
" was no sooner apprised of it, than he made a
" public retractation, and carried the satisfacti-
" on, which he there gave to Sir Robert South-
" well, much farther than Sir Robert himself
" desired. This retractation may be seen prin-
" ted by way of addition to the first part of
" his apology for the catholics. Mr. Arnauld,
" in this rencounter, had the consolation to
" learn from Sir Robert Southwell himself,
" that his Britannic majesty (then Duke of
" York), having been informed of this mis-
" take, had the goodness to excuse this doctor
" [Arnauld]; and to be willing to become
" surety for his good faith, and for the plea-
" sure with which he would address himself
" to repair his fault; his majesty having said
" to Mr. *Southwell*, that Mr. *Arnauld*, *being*
" *a stranger*, *had not been able to distinguish*
" *true advices from such as were false; but*
" *that*, *being a person so esteemed for his lear-*
" *ning and probity*, *he could not but rejoice at*
" *being undeceived*, *and would with pleasure*
" *give all the satisfaction in this matter which*
" *should be required of him.* His Britannic
" majesty, having learned afterwards in what
" manner Mr. Arnauld had made reparation
" for his fault, had the goodness to desire to
" see the letter he had written to Mr. South-
" well; and, after having kept it a whole day,
" said, in returning it to Sir Robert, that *it*
" *was a very handsome letter*, *and such a one*
" *as might be expected from Mr. Arnauld.*"
Histoire abregee de la vie, et des ouvrages de Mr. Arnauld, a Cologne, 1695, p. 187 The

truth is, Arnauld was no more able to distinguish true intelligence from false in other cases, than he was in this of Sir Robert Southwell. Had some of the witnesses, upon whose testimony he hath descanted, been of equal quality with Sir Robert Southwell, and had expostulated with him in the same spirit on his misrepresentations of their evidence, Arnauld might have had the additional pleasure of retracting the far greater part of what he wrote concerning the popish plot, as may be seen by comparing his Apology with the printed trials of Coleman, Stafford, &c. The Duke of York's observation, concerning Arnauld's inability to distinguish true advices from false, is very just, and the more to be remarked, as it is highly probable that Arnauld had all his intelligence concerning the plot, true, or false, from his Royal Highness's favourites and implements. This trash the papists of the present times are now bringing back, by way of discrediting the popish plot, and opposing to our public records the dreams of foreigners, founded on the fabulous intelligence conveyed by their forefathers to such zealots as Arnauld, whose reputation, they hoped, in after-times, might tend to make their wicked and desperate machinations incredible to posterity. With these kind of apologies the protestants of the present times may be duped if they please, without looking back to their own authentic records, which, however, it would be adviseable for them to do. For, as a candid and judicious lawyer of those times has observed, "that which gave credit to the popish plot, "was, writings, concurring with oral testi-

"mony. For," adds he, "very little of the "truth of the popish plot depended on the "credit of Oates, Bedloe, or any other person; "most of the facts of that design, when disco-"vered, proving themselves." Hawles's *Remarks on several trials*, fol. 1689, p. 4. As I have Arnauld's Apology before me, I will just mention, that I learn from it, that the jesuit *La Colombiere*, almoner to the Duchess of York, and the person by whose means *the devotion to the sacred heart*, &c. abovementioned, was revived, was accused of having a hand in the popish plot, and, in consequence of that charge, which consisted of six articles, imprisoned. What was the event, Mr. Arnauld could give no account; nor is it at all to my purpose to inquire into his guilt, farther than to observe, that the fifth article of his charge was, that *he had the care of a convent of religious females, secreted in London.* A circumstance which shews the adaption of his talents to practise upon a poor visionary nun, in the gross manner pretty plainly suggested in the narrative above exhibited.

ADDITIONAL EXTRACTS.

ANECDOTE *from Mr.* Selden's *Table-Talk, under the word* POPE, p. 129.

"THE papists call our religion a parliamentary religion. But there was once, I am "sure, a parliamentary pope. Pope Urban "[VI] was made pope in England, by act of "parliament, against pope Clement [VII]. "The act is not in the book of statutes, either "because he that compiled the book would "not have the name of Pope there, or else he "would not let it appear that they meddled "with any such thing. But it is upon the "rolls."

A learned antiquary, and worthy divine of the church of England, whose name I am not at liberty to mention, being desirous to have this curious fact verified and authenticated by the record itself, applied to the late George Holmes, Esq. keeper of the records in the tower of London, by whose permission and assistance he transcribed the act as follows, out of the statute roll of the 2d year of King Richard II.

"Item pur ceo qe notre seigneur le roy ad "entenduz sibien par certeyns lettres patentes

" nouvellement venuz de certains cardinalx
" rebelx contre notre sant piere Urban a ore
" pape come autrement par comon fame qe
" division et discord estoit parentre notre dit
" saint piere et les ditz cardinalx la quex saf-
" forcent a tout leur poiar a deposer notre dit
" seint piere de l'estat de pape et de exciter et
" commover per leur mesmes uraies suggesti-
" ons les rois princes et le people christien en
" contre luy a grant peril de leur almes et a tres
" male example. Notre dit seigneur le roy
" fist monster les dites lettres a prelates seig-
" neurs et autrez grantz et sages de son roialme
" est eantz au dit parliament et veues et en-
" tenduz les lettres avandites et evemenre de-
" liberation sur la matier estoit par le ditz pre-
" lates pronunziez et publiez par plusors gran-
" dez et notable raisons illoeques montrez en
" plein parliament sibien par matier trove en
" dites lettres come autrement qe le dit Urban
" estoit duement esluz en pape et qe ensy est
" il et doit estre verrai pape et le come pape et
" chief de seint esglise l'en doit accepter et
" obeir et a ceo fair saccorderent toutes lez
" prelats seigneurs et commons en le parlia-
" ment avandit. Et en aultre est assentuz qe
" toutes les benefices et autres possessions qe
" les ditz cardinalx rebellantz et toutz autres
" leur coadjutours fautors adherentz ou aucuns
" autres enemies de notre dit seigneur le roi et
" de son roialme ont deniz [f. deinz] le poair
" notre dit seigneur le roi soient seisez es mains
" de mesme notre seigneur le roi et qe notre
" seigneur le roi soit responduz des fruites et
" profites de mesmes benefices et possessions
" tant come ils demouront en ses mains par le

" cause avantdit. Et auxint est ordenez qe si
" aucun liege de roi ou autre deinz son poair
" purchase provision benefice ou autre grace
" daucun par noun de pape qe de le dit notre
" saint piere Urban ou soit obeisant a aucun
" autre persone come a pape soit mys hors de
" la protection de notre seigneur le roi et les
" biens et chateuz seises come forfaites."

In English thus.

" Also because our lord the king hath un-
" derstood, as well by certain letters patent
" lately come from certain cardinals rebels
" against our holy father Urban at this time
" pope, as otherwise by common fame, that
" division and discord have arisen between
" our said holy father and the said cardinals,
" who labour with all their might to depose
" our said holy father from the estate of pope,
" and to provoke and stir up against him kings,
" princes, and christian people, by their own
" mere suggestions, to the great peril of their
" souls, and setting an evil example to others;
" our said lord the king caused the said letters
" to be shewn to the prelates, lords, and other
" grandees and sages of his kingdom, being at
" the said parliament. And the letters afore-
" said being seen and understood, and mature
" deliberation had upon the matter, it was by
" the said prelates declared and for many great
" and notable reasons there shewn in full par-
" liament, as well from the contents of the said
" letters as otherwise, that the said Urban was
" duly elected pope, and so is and ought to be
" true pope; and as pope, and head of holy

" church, he ought to be received and obeyed;
" and to do this the prelates, lords, and com-
" mons in the parliament before-mentioned
" agree. And moreover it is agreed, that all
" the benefices and other possessions, which
" the said rebellious cardinals, and all others
" their coadjutors, fautors, adherents, and any
" other enemies of our said lord the king and
" of his kingdom, have within the jurisdiction
" of our said lord the king, shall be seized
" into the hands of the same our lord the king;
" and that our lord the king shall be accoun-
" table for the fruits and profits of the same
" benefices and possessions, so long as they
" shall remain in his hands, for the cause
" before-mentioned. And furthermore it is
" enacted, that if any liegeman of the king, or
" any other within his jurisdiction, shall pur-
" chase any provision, benefice, or any other
" grace, of any person by the name of pope,
" save of our said holy father Urban, or shall
" yield obedience to any other person as pope,
" he shall be put out of the protection of our
" lord the king, and his goods and chattels
" seized as forfeited."

Perhaps it may not be unacceptable to the reader, to see a short account of this pope Urban and these rebellious cardinals, and of the motives which disposed King Richard II. and his parliament to take this extraordinary step in favour of Urban, from Rapin's History of England.

" Gregory XI. having left Avignon, on
" account of certain pretended revelations, in
" order to go and reside at Rome, died March
" 7th, 1378. Of the three and twenty cardi-

" nals then in being, six staid at Avignon, one
" was upon a legateship, and the sixteen others,
" of whom twelve were Frenchmen, and four
" Italians, were at Rome when Gregory died.
" These cardinals being assembled in the con-
" clave, in order to proceed to the election of
" a pope, were in great perplexity. Their in-
" tent was to chuse a Frenchman but, as they
" foresaw the people of Rome would be
" against it, they resolved to give them a seem-
" ing satisfaction, by pretending to elect an
" Italian. But they agreed among themselves
" beforehand, that as soon as they could act
" with freedom, they would chuse another who
" should be the true pope; a project which could
" hardly fail of begetting a schism. According to
" their agreement, of which we could have no
" certainty but by their own confession, they
" elected the archbishop of Bari, a Neapolitan,
" who assumed the name of Urban VI. The
" election was notified to all christian princes
" as canonical by the cardinals themselves the
" electors, and for some time they themselves
" acknowledged Urban as head of the church.
" Notwithstanding, whether in pursuance of
" their agreement, or whether, as some affirm,
" on the score of Urban's treating them with
" too great haughtiness, these same cardinals
" met at Anagnia, and elected one of the car-
" dinals of Avignon, who stiled himself Cle-
" ment VII. These two elections by the same
" persons employed a long time the most no-
" ted divines in Europe, and occasioned a
" schism which lasted above thirty years. It
" ought not to seem strange that it should be

" so difficult a matter to decide which of the " popes was the head of the church. It would " have been much easier to alledge good rea- " sons to reject them both. However, this " schism divided all christendom, each state " declaring for one or other of the two popes, " not so much from the consideration of the " right of the parties, as for reasons of state. " France, whose interest it was that the pope " should reside at Avignon, sided with Cle- " ment; and, for a contrary reason, England " thought it more advantageous to adhere to " the pope of Rome." *Tindal's Translation*, 8vo. 1727, vol. IV. p. 377.

" France," says Dr. Geddes, " declared it- " self presently for Clement, and so did Scot- " land, Castile, Arragon, and Sicily. Eng- " land, which in those days understood its own " interest so well as not to do a thing that " would visibly advance the power of France, " declared presently for Urban; and, besides " Rome and a part of Italy, it was the only " country I can find that declared for him at " first." *Tracts*, 1730, vol. III. p. 293. And as according to the same learned writer, [*ibid.* p. 304.] " Urban and his successors, and not " Clement and his, are, by all the Roman wri- " ters since the end of that schism, reckoned " to have been the true bishops of Rome," the roman catholics are not a little obliged to the English parliament for legitimating the succession of the popes by so early and so essential a sanction. We may hope, at least, that after this discovery the papists, out of mere prudence, will cease to upbraid us with a parliamentary religion.

If the Scottish records so far back were in being, it is not impossible that an act of their parliament in favour of Clement VII. might be found among them. Mr. Bower's history of this schism is excellent, and makes one regret that he did not or could not take more time in the history of some of those popes who lived nearer the present times. The literary world are not at all obliged to those who diverted him so long from this useful and edifying employment.

It was usual with an eminent protestant divine [Dr. Holland,] when he took leave of his friends, to say, *Commendo vos amori Dei, et odio Papismi;* I commend you to the love of God, and the hatred of popery.* I have no scruple in bidding adieu to my protestant readers in the same terms. It is a just and a pious recommendation. The love of God and the love of popery are irreconcileable. Whoever gives up his judgment and conscience to the spiritual dominion of mortal man, does it out of a sort of fear which casteth out love.

* See the life of bishop Kennett, Appendix, p. 270.

FINIS.

FOUR

DISCOURSES.

I. On the Duty of a Christian Minister under the obligation of conforming to a National Religion established by the Civil Powers.

II. On the Questions, What is Christianity? and, Where is it to be learned?

III. On the true Meaning of the Phrase, THE INTERESTS OF RELIGION.

IV. On the Original Principles of the FIRST PROTESTANTS.

Delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Cleveland, in the years 1767, 1769, 1771, and 1773.

[FIRST PRINTED, MDCCLXXV.]

PREFACE.

THE variety of publications that have appeared for and against a reformation of our ecclesiastical forms of doctrine and worship, may seem to afford any man, who hath employed his studies on such subjects, a sufficient apology for throwing into the collection a few of his own sentiments, upon the presumption of his having an equal right to be heard with others, whom either the general importance of the disquisition, or some critical occasion, hath engaged to take a share in the debate.

It may be alledged, perhaps, that in the way the following discourses were first delivered, nothing should be said that is not in perfect agreement with the established ordinances of the church, which have not only the sanction of public authority, but, as it is generally supposed, the full approbation of our common superiors with respect to their propriety and fitness to promote the true ends of the christian religion.

But as suggestions of this kind seem to imply, that, where public authority interposes, the clergy should have no judgment of their own, even in matters which so nearly concern them, and may be thought to exhibit too

much of the το θαυμαξειν προσωπον δυναςων,* for the digestion of a good christian in any station, they may well be postponed to considerations of another kind.

As protestants, we have adopted another standard of judgment, and it is but candid to leave the question open for a fair discussion, and to allow the scriptures to have their weight as far as their authority will go; and I am sure it is but decent to suppose, that the approbation of our superiors will not be found in that scale where the scriptures are not.

If the objection is only levelled at the impropriety of appearing to espouse a party where the hearers are as capable judges of the subject as the speaker himself, I hope I may be allowed to take shelter under the example of some of my more considerable brethren in the same office, who have delivered themselves with all freedom upon the question, when and where they could by no means be certain of the unanimity of their several audiences.†

It is true, some of their Dissertations are said to have been published at the request of the reverend bodies to which they were respectively addressed. To distinctions of that sort the following discourses have no pretensions, and now appear, not as peculiarly calculated for the notice of the clergy, but in the way of appeal to the judgment of the public in general, which is not often biassed in these days, by the quality of the sponsors, who, by solliciting the publication of such performances, may be un-

* Compare Levit. xix. 15. lxx. with Jude 16.

† See the charges of the Doctors *Rutherforth*, *Balguy*, *Tottie*, &c.

derstood to pledge their credit for the excellence of them.

I freely own I have always considered the laity, and have often wished the laity would consider themselves as greatly interested in the conduct and ministrations of the clergy; and that both would pay a mutual attention to each other in what concerns the common edification of the christian brotherhood. With these sentiments, I hold myself obliged to give some account to both, of the motives which have led me sometimes to deviate in the following discourses from the track in which many names of renown have travelled, not without great applause, and a numerous suite of disciples.

The *first* of these discourses took its rise from a suspicion, that the younger, and the less capable part of the clergy, studious and attentive to discharge their duty according to *the due order of the church*, might sometimes overlook what the holy scripture requires of us towards *making full proof of our ministry*.

A serious reader of the scriptures, having this case in his view, will readily discover, that a mere compliance with our rubrical and canonical directions, though ever so punctual and exact, will not answer all the ends of our peculiar calling, of *warning the unruly, comforting the feeble-minded, supporting the weak*, and in exercising that *patience* and *diligent circumspection* prescribed to those who watch for the souls of their respective flocks, and expect to be called to give account of their fidelity in that important province.

The church of England, in particular cases,

leaves a great deal to the *ghostly counsel and advice of the minister*, over and besides the provision made in her public forms for the consolation and relief of her conscientious members; and for this purpose, proposes the *ministry of God's word*, as the supplementary aid to the *discrete* and *learned minister*,* who, in the variety of exigencies that may fall in his way, will find occasion to apply it in many instances where he will have no direction, but from the circumstances of the case proposed to him, and his own good sense, in adapting his counsel to those circumstances. And indeed, if barely using the forms of our establised liturgy, or applying the doctrines of the church exhibited in the articles, homilies, &c. were sufficient for all purposes of this sort, a great number of learned and able divines of our church have strangely misemployed their time and their talents, in stating cases of conscience, and giving solutions of them, from their own sense of scripture; and this, as some of them have said, with a view to accommodate such of the clergy, as, on account of their other employments, have not time to make themselves masters of the science of casuistry, by a systematical study.†

But without any particular respect to those more intricate questions, for the solution of which the adepts in casuistical learning are obliged to have recourse to a variety of laws besides the christian scriptures,‡ there are many

* See the first exhortation in the Communion office, and the Rubrics in that for the Visitation of the sick.

† See the preface to bishop Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium*, at the beginning.

‡ According to the emblem at the beginning of bishop Taylor's

cases where the scriptures *alone* are *profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness,* and may be *profitably* applied in the daily intercourse a serious minister hath with his parishioners, where no extraordinary talents are required on either side, to bring the instruction home to the understanding and conscience of the party concerned to receive it.

If any clergyman should be so far prepossessed in favour of the forms provided by public authority, as to think them sufficient for all cases of this kind, he would perhaps alter his mind, upon having a little more experience in a different situation. There are numbers, undoubtedly, who may content themselves with the edification they receive from our public ministrations. But our common forms, besides being rendered languid and uninteresting by frequent repetition, are too general to take in the occasions and necessities of many individuals, who have a more affecting sense of religion upon their minds than is felt by others who discover less concern, or less lively impressions of the necessity of caring for their salvation upon the terms of the gospel.

To obviate misapprehensions of this kind, whether proceeding from indolence, secular dissipation, or prejudices of education, it seemed expedient to represent in a short historical account, from what circumstances human establishments of religion took their rise,

book, an adroit Caſuiſt ſhould be well acquainted with the *law of nature,* the *law of right reaſon,* the *Moſaic law,* the *law of the goſpel,* the *law of the Holy Spirit,* the *law of man,* and the *law of cuſtom.*

to what corruptions they have been liable, and how those corruptions have defeated the laudable ends for which they were understood to be originally instituted; and then, by way of contrast with this representation, to state the nature and tendency of that religious reformation intended by our blessed Saviour in the dispensation he came upon earth to reveal and to propagate. And lastly, to shew, from the moderation used in the present administration of our ecclesiastical discipline, the room and encouragement we have to exert ourselves in promoting the religious improvement of our people, many degrees beyond the performance of our legally prescribed duty, though discharged with the utmost punctuality.

In pursuing this subject, it was hardly possible to overlook a case of great importance to the honour and credit of our religion, and the private satisfaction of a greater number of our worthy and conscientious brethren, than perhaps may be apprehended from mere appearances.

Every one is not equally bigotted to human establishments of religion, nor is every clergyman so careless and unconcerned about the consistency of one part of his duty with another, as not to reflect, how far the obligations he is under as a minister of the established church, may be warranted by any authority supposed to be given in the scriptures to impose them. A disposition to examine into this matter, may create doubts and difficulties concerning the rectitude of complying with what a serious man may suspect to be contrary to the

terms of his commission, as it is exhibited in the christian scriptures.

On another hand, a clergyman of the established church can hardly officiate in any branch of his public duty, without meeting with some reference or appeal to the scriptures, as the foundation upon which our ecclesiastical forms are built. And it can hardly be, but that some will concern themselves to examine whether this foundation is well laid, and the superstructure carried up in conformity to the rule that the compilers of our public offices declare they adopted and adhered to, in framing the several parts of our present church establishment.

Clergymen, indeed, may be very differently qualified for inquiries of this sort. Some, and they perhaps a majority, may not, for reasons hereafter to be given, be sufficiently capable of carrying on such examinations to any decision satisfactory to themselves. Others may have better means and capacities for these investigations; and if to a serious and diligent inquirer, the forms by which he is required to officiate in the church appear, in particular instances, to be in disagreement with the written word, he may well question with himself, whether his usefulness in other respects will excuse his compliance with forms which he apprehends to be unscriptural.

I have but just touched upon this case in the first of these discourses, and as it is a case of great delicacy, I am very unwilling to enlarge upon it. But having, since that discourse was first delivered, been particularly affected by the secession of a most worthy and valua-

ble friend,* for whose sentiments I may be allowed to have some degree of partiality, it may perhaps be expected I should give this matter a little farther consideration.

Every one must allow, that, in cases of this nature, the party concerned must be finally determined by his own understanding and conscience. No man can pretend to give a righteous sentence, but he who has the whole evidence, of which the matter in question is capable, before him; and the testimony of conscience cannot be made use of, but by the man who feels the impression it makes upon himself.

Upon these grounds, the reasons alledged by this worthy person for quitting his station in the established church are *unanswerable*, and his conduct *irreproachable;* and the invidious reflections that have been cast upon him for taking this step, will derive no great reputation upon his censurers, either for their good sense, their christian charity, or their good manners. No man can know how far this valuable man is, or judge how far he ought to be affected by the reasons offered in his Apology, so well as himself; and for any other man to say, those reasons are not sufficient to justify a separation from the established church, is only saying, either that the objector has no such reasons, or that, if he had them, he should not think them sufficient to justify *his own* separation.

I should not indeed blame any man, who, from the same or any other motives wherein

* The Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, late vicar of Catterick in Yorkshire.

his conscience is concerned, should separate himself from the church, without making any apology at all for his conduct. I must freely confess, I should not, in the like circumstances, be at all disposed to refer my case to the judgment of the public, unless I could allow the public a right to over-rule my own sentiments, and to determine for me how I should act, either with or against my own convictions. A protestant, who grounds his principles on what appears to him the genuine sense of scripture, and is conscious that in using his christian liberty, he infringes no civil ordinance respecting the peace and welfare of the community, is under no obligation to account to the public for deserting the established system, when that system appears to him to desert the standard of religious faith and duty it professes to follow. It is a matter entirely betwixt God and the man's own conscience, in which it is not to be expected the public should be either equitable or competent judges. To apologize indeed in such a case, is a commendable instance of candour and sincerity, but is by no means what the public has a right to expect.

"Yes," say some people, "surely such an "apology is indispensably necessary, especially "from a clergyman, on account of the scan- "dal and offence his separation may give to "the serious and well-disposed members of the "established church, upon which his secession "will be understood to imply a charge of "something criminal in their conformity."

But perhaps it may be a more difficult matter to conjure down this dæmon of scandal

than these well-disposed members of the church may imagine. A dissenter would tell them, that he is equally scandalized when one of his teachers conforms to the established church, and has equal reason to expect an apology from *him*. And I confess, I have not that veneration for the dignity of an establishment, as to think there is more reason for the one expectation than the other.

But let us confine our speculations to the case before us. Let us suppose the worthy man who has so sensibly and affectingly apologised for his secession, had continued in the church after his objections to her forms of doctrine and worship had been known, or upon some probable presumptions violently suspected, would the tongue of scandal and offence have been silent, or less querulous, upon this discovery?

Let us appeal to some late transactions in a remarkable case, for an answer to this question.

It is no long time since a masterly performance appeared, under the title of *Considerations on the propriety of requiring subscriptions to articles of faith;* in which the subject is treated with uncommon temper, and a strength of reasoning that will hardly be broken by the efforts of such advocates as have lately been employed on the other side of the question.

It is not to be expected, that writings of this tendency should be left to make their natural impression upon the public without opposition. Accordingly, an answer was soon dispatched from the Clarendon press; for the merits of which, the reader may be referred to a little

piece, intituled, *A Defence of the Considerations, &c. printed for Wilkie,* 1774.

But so it happened, that besides the arguments offered in these *Considerations,* importing the impropriety of requiring the usual subscriptions, the author thought proper to offer a plea for such of the clergy "as may continue " to minister in, or communicate with the " church, though they may think something " or other may be made better, and more adapted to the ends of religion and the interests " of christianity."

At this opening, which he thought afforded him an opportunity of a personal attack that was not to be slighted, the answerer enters with all alacrity, but, as it often happens to such adventurers, with a zeal too impetuous to allow him time to chuse the ground on which he might engage to the best advantage.

He observes, that "a clergyman's accepting " of benefices, dignities, and a bishoprick, " and on every new promotion repeating his " subscriptions and declarations, joining in " the prayers of the church, and saying in the " face of the congregation, that he believes " what he does not; and then pleads for his " conduct, and his remaining in the church, " and rising from one post to another, that it " is that he may do more good, and perform " a more acceptable service to his master, is " plainly in scripture language, *Let us do* " *evil, that good may come.*"*

* See the London Magazine *for June* 1774, p. 293.

In the like strain of *piety* and *christian benevolence*, another steeled champion falls upon the Considerer, in no very wise apostrophe to a mitre, which perhaps would fit any head that is intituled to wear one; but which, that this adventurer might not appear *to fight as one that beateth the air*, is clapped upon the head of the author of the Considerations, inscribed with the above-mentioned motto, *Let us do evil, that good may come.**

When such inquisitors of heretical pravity are abroad, it must needs be that offences come

* See *A scriptural confutation of the arguments against the one Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, produced by the Rev. Mr. Lindsey in his late Apology*, p. 227. As wise or as witty as these gentlemen may think themselves in applying scripture language to the condemnation of those they do not like, they must bear to be told, that they mistake the meaning of the text they have thus quoted and applied; for I must not suppose they would wilfully pervert it, merely for the pious pleasure of defaming an adversary. That indeed would be to abuse the apostle Paul, as well as the author of the Considerations. The words are so far from being scripture language, as good christians understand that phrase, that they are the language of Paul's calumniators which he disowns, and are equivalent to a mistaken inference that others with a better meaning, perhaps, might draw from his premises, viz. *Let us continue to sin, that grace may abound*, or *that greater good may come:* i. e. that the glory of God may become more conspicuous or illustrious, the farther his pardoning grace is extended to the sins of mankind; [see *Grotius upon* Rom. vi. 8. and *Le Clerc on* Rom. iii. 8.] which is a very different kind of good, from the edification proposed to be communicated to certain persons, by conforming to the erroneous system they espouse, by way of having a freer access to them. A case more like that of St. Paul, who *to the Jews became a Jew that he might gain the Jews*, &c. Rom. ix. 20, 21, 22. But if these gentlemen have not the charity to make allowances of this sort, they should have the justice to be certain that the author of the Considerations adopts the premises they have laid down for him, before they draw their conclusion, lest they should incur the condemnation of St. Paul's *slanderous reporters*, and so,

Evil on itself should back recoil.

from the most innocent, and even the most laudable actions. It should however be remembered, that the woe to him by whom the offence cometh, may belong to the man who takes it, as well as to him who gives it, especially when it is taken from calumny and misrepresentation.

For against whom are these zealous writers pouring out this torrent of satire and indignation? If the figure they are exhibiting to the public is not a mere pageant of their own dressing up, why do they not give it a name, that we may know and beware of it? If they are right in their conjectures concerning the author of the Considerations, are they certain, that their charge against him of duplicity and prevarication is not a mere slander?

It is plain the answerer does not know the explicit opinion of that author concerning the Trinity, for he wishes to know it.* The *Scriptural Confuter*, seems to take it for granted, that the said author is an heretic of the same stamp with the apologist against whom he hath prepared his voluminous antidote; and yet if common fame is not mistaken in the person to whom these considerations are ascribed, I could shew this zealous orthodox champion, some passages in that eminent writer's acknowledged works, for which he was reproved with no little bitterness, by a noted Antitrinitarian, and reckoned among the most bigotted *churchists*, who, in the reprovers opinion, deserved no quarter.

* See *Defence of the Considerations*, p. 37.

The good of it is, that no man can have much to fear from the wrath of a writer whose intemperate zeal and arrogance prompts him profanely to boast, that "if his own argument "[in behalf of the Trinity] is not decisive, "the spirit of truth must be a liar, and the "simple and guileless zeal of the apostles, "crafty and designing duplicity."*

The orthodoxy of the answerer of the Considerations is not quite so extravagant. He acknowledges, "there are some things in the ar- "ticles and liturgy of the church of England, "which he would be glad to see amended, "though, he believes, not the same as the pe- "titioning clergy would object to."*

This answerer is commonly reported to be one who hath already passed through the hands of some of these petitioners, not much to his comfort or his reputation.* If so, he ought to know by this time, that the petitioning clergy, as petitioners, meddle not with any particular articles of the church of England, but object to any subscription to articles of faith, except such as are recognised by a subscription to the scriptures only.

The answerer however, has his objections, as well as the petitioning clergy, to some things in the articles and liturgy, and would be glad to have them amended. He must, then, of course be sorry in some degree, that they are not amended; and perhaps not the less sorry,

* *Scriptural Confutation*, p. 229.—† *London Magazine*, u. s.

‡ See *Letters to a Member of Parliament*, in which the present design of removing subscription to human articles of faith is vindicated, in oppofition to Archdeacon Randolph's Charge, &c. Printed for Wilkie and Merril, 1772.

on account of his obligation to subscribe them as agreeable to the word of God. What may these *some things* be? The public has at least as much right to know them, as the answerer hath to know the opinion of the author of the considerations, concerning the doctrine of the Trinity. How else shall we be certain, that this rigid censor himself is not doing evil that good may come. He hath said, "that if people "will keep their opinions to themselves, no "man will hurt them."* If this is his refuge, his distress is to be pitied, but he should be advised by his friends to change his plan when he next undertakes the defence of subscriptions.

It seems to be the misfortune of these gentlemen that they want to be taken for popes, at the same time that they expose their fallibility by the most manifest indications. But to do them justice, it is a misfortune not peculiar to them and their fraternity, but too often incident to others whose creed consists of very different articles. There are too many in different religious societies, who will not allow, that any man should have any doubts or difficulties concerning certain points of doctrine, because they themselves have none; as if there was that precision in their theological speculations, which should conclude all men, whatever their capacities are, or whatever their course of study or education may have been.

If these enlightened writers on the one side and the other, will needs have it, that all the world are prejudiced except themselves, and those who think as they do, let them consider

* See *The Defence of the Considerations*, p. 2.

at least, that prejudices are not to be eradicated all at once, and that what they may think fit to call prejudices, afford as strong convictions to very honest minds, as what they take to be rational deductions do to themselves.

The different ideas which even scripture language gives to very learned and eminent men, with respect to points of theology controverted both in former and later times, may afford a very reasonable apology for persons of inferior talents who range themselves on different sides of the dispute, and also for others who hesitate, without any just imputation upon their understandings or their sincerity.

A recent instance may perhaps illustrate this matter to better effect, than an example taken from a remoter age.

A learned and very able writer hath informed us, in a publication of this present year, that Grotius, Stillingfleet, and other learned men, "have defended two propositions, as "the fundamental doctrines of christianity, "both which are *contrary to the old testament*, "and *absolutely false.*"* He brings in Dr. Clarke for a share of the censure, observing however, "that the Doctor hath varied the "phrase, and softened the doctrine, to make "it less liable to exception."

The matter is of no small importance, and there are some things in our established forms concerning this subject, (the satisfaction made to God by the death of Christ) which cannot be vindicated, if the propositions above-mentioned are not true. The reasoning of this masterly writer upon these propositions, de-

* The Apology of Benjamin Mordecai for embracing the christian religion, Letter v. p. 26.

serves the most serious attention. On the other hand, the arguments of Grotius, Stillingfleet, Clarke, &c. are by no means void of strength, and the appearance at least of solidity.

What shall an honest conscientious conformist, who is dubious which of these disputants is in the right, do in such a case? It should seem to be no light matter to adhere to a church, and more especially in the character of an officiating minister, which adopts propositions as *fundamental doctrines of christianity*, that are *absolutely false;* nor, on the other hand, is it a trifle to go over to a church, which denies a proposition as *absolutely false*, that, for ought the doubter knows, may be *a fundamental doctrine of christianity.*

It is an easy matter for these adepts who are prepared to determine *de omni scibili*, to say to the doubter, "examine the scriptures for your "self, and form your creed according to the "light you may receive from thence." Alas he hath been sent thither before by both parties, and hath not met with the satisfaction he seeks; not for want of diligence in the search, or a desire to be informed of the truth, but for want of that capacity to discern and judge, which enables men *more happily gifted*, to form their opinions upon the *slightest inspection* of the proofs adduced on either side. A very honest and a very sensible man may be under the like dilemma, with respect to other doctrines espoused by the church established. Nor, as far as I know, would the matter be mended, should the doubter go over to the dissenters of any denomination, who have all

of them their theological nostrums respectively, the authority of which will appear to a candid examiner to depend, for the most part, upon something far short of demonstration.

The misfortune is, that most of these disputable questions are about such things as are quite out of the reach of our knowledge and ought not, for that reason, to have been formed into articles of faith, merely because they who laid down and established the terms of communion in particular churches, pretended to comprehend them.*

Had the first founders of these particuar churches foreseen, how much their decisions would have perplexed men more diffident than themselves, or, if you please, of capacities less comprehensive than their own, they must have been very wicked to have laid such snares in the way of posterity. I speak of christian and protestant founders. But we are taught to believe, and indeed upon probable evidence, that the first framers of our established forms,

* Mr. Le Clerc, speaking of those fathers who disputed whether the angels have bodies, says, that they who held the affirmative side of the question, "have alledged no evident reason to prove it, "and all that can be concluded from the controversy is, that each "affirmed or denied a thing concerning which they had no know-"ledge." Upon which he observes, "We should suspend our "judgment, and affirm nothing concerning any subject which is "equally unknown to us. But such a suspension suits not with the "*Dogmatics*, who can hardly confess that they know not all things; "and believe it is the part of an ingenious man to determine himself "speedily upon all sorts of questions. Indeed, without this, it is not "possible to frame a system as complete as it ought to be, to be ac-"counted a learned man; and it would be a shameful thing to con-"fess, that a thousand questions might be asked upon every article, "which could not be answered, if one should say nothing but what "one knows." Life of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, p. 56, 57.

were pious and humble men, who had the best meanings, as well as the strongest convictions, that the system of theology they composed for public use, was in every respect in perfect conformity with the word of God. We now perceive however that they presumed too far on their own abilities and discernment, and the least we ought to do, is so far to retrench their plan, as to release ourselves and our conscientious brethren, from the necessity of declaring assent and consent to points of doctrine, concerning which our reformers could know nothing, any more than we, or nothing more than they could gather from the general doctrines the Spirit of God hath thought fit to communicate in the scriptures, the common directory of *our* faith, as well as *theirs*.

But as their system continues to be bound upon us by the laws of a civil establishment, and is not likely to be reduced, in the present age, to a more liberal standard of conformity, and is yet adhered to by so large a majority of our fellow-christians, and has in it so many excellent things which may be turned to the use of edification, without any especial respect to the abstruse and scholastic doctrines, that are held up as the shibboleth of the church, (which after all allows us to bring them to the test of the scriptures) it may be worth the consideration of a serious minister of the gospel, how far he may be justified, upon the whole, in leaving his station, where he hath so many fair occasions of being profitable to the people under his care, and exchanging it for another, where the very circumstance of his having a new foundation to lay, must make his success

in the practical and far more important part of duty, extremely precarious.

It is, I freely own, a mean and disingenuous part in any clergyman of the establishment to gloss over the faults and blemishes of it, and to defend all the forms in use, merely for the purpose of exculpating himself for continuing to officiate in the church; but I will not scruple to say, that no man has a right to charge another with hypocrisy and duplicity, who fairly and openly declares his sentiments on these defects, and not only wishes, but uses his best endeavours to have them reformed.

A sensible man who has objections to the forms and ordinances received in the religious society with which he is in communion, may have reasons of conscience inducing him seriously to deliberate whether he is obliged to separate from it on account of those objections? There have been, both in former and latter times, many wise and good men who have thought it a matter of no little consequence to separate from a society professing itself a christian church, and adopting the scriptures as the only authentic rule of the faith and duty of its members, even though it should have adopted some very exceptionable principles and practices into its established constitution.*

* If I should mention Erasmus and father Paul as instances, I doubt not but I should be told, that we in these days, have better lights concerning christian obligations, than were afforded to those times in which these eminent men flourished. It may be so, and it may be otherwise, according as different men cultivate the means of information afforded them respectively. But in either case it is not nothing that the learned Jortin hath offered by way of apology for Erasmus, (Life, vol. i. p. 274—276.) where perhaps he was not totally forgetful of his own situation. Father Paul's convictions, if

The sense that one man has of the church's deviations from her acknowledged rule, would not probably justify him in separating from

we may believe bishop Burnet (Life of bishop Bedell, p. 15, 16.) were more pungent. "He wished he could have left Venice, "and come over to England with Mr. Bedell;" in order, we must suppose, to exchange the popish for the protestant religion; but having found this impracticable, "he made a shift to comply, "as far as he could, with the established way of their worship; but "he had, in many things, particular methods, by which, he in a "great measure, rather quieted than satisfied his conscience. In "saying of mass, he passed over many parts of the canon, and in par-"ticular, those prayers in which that sacrifice was offered up to the "honour of saints. He never prayed to saints, nor joined in those parts "of the offices that went against his conscience. And in private con-"fessions and discourses, he took the people off from those abuses, "and gave them right notions of the purity of the christian religion; "so he hoped, he was sowing seeds that might be fruitful in another "age; and thus he believed he might live innocent in a church "that he thought so defiled." I must own I do not understand the difference between *quieting* and *satisfying* the conscience; nor can I find out what might be bishop Burnet's idea of such difference, unless it may be explained by this good bishop's continuing in the church of England, notwithstanding the representation he has given of it in the valuable conclusion of the History of his own Times. Upon that supposition, might I not fairly offer this worthy prelate, as well as the excellent Jortin, as examples of wise and good men reconciling themselves to conformity, in a church which, though very far from faultless in their account, was still less obnoxious than the church to which Erasmus and father Paul adhered? But to proceed a little farther with father Paul. Bishop Bedell, in a sermon by him preached from Revelations xviii. 4. *Come out of her my people*, &c. undertakes, among other things, to apologize for some who continued in communion with the church of Rome, in which bishop Burnet "did not doubt but he had his "friend *Padre Paulo* in his thoughts." (Life of Bedell, p. 156.) The whole citation is well worth the perusal, if it is but as a matter of curiosity. But I shall only select one passage, which if it will apply in the case of father Paul, the benefit of it may *a fortiori* be claimed by the conformists to a less exceptionable church. "Neither," says the preacher, "let that hard term of hypocrisie be used of the "infirmity, and sometime of humble and peaceable carriage of some that

communion with her; at the same time that another man, who considers her deviations in another view, may think his separation from

" oppose not common errors, nor wrestle with the greater part of men, " do follow the multitude, reserving a right knowledge to them- " selves; and sometimes (by the favour which God gives them " to find where they live) obtain better conditions than others can." Life of Bedell, p. 162. The latter part of this passage seems evidently to point out the case and circumstances of father Paul, and is not perhaps much different from that of some worthy persons among ourselves. Bishop Burnet says, " when one pressed father Paul " hard in this matter, and objected, that he still held communion " with an idolatrous church, and gave it credit by adhering outwardly to it, by which others that depended much on his " example, would be likewise encouraged to continue in it, " all the answer he made to this was, That God had " not given him the spirit of Luther." Father Paul however had something else to say for himself. " The fabric of God's church," says he, " though it be built by so great an architect, yet always " has had, and will have its imperfections, through the defect " and fault of the materials; provided the foundation be good, we " must bear with other faults, and look upon them as human weaknesses.—A man that would needs have every thing done to perfection, ought to remember the saying of the gospel, *How then shall the scriptures be fulfilled.*" *Letters.* xxx. In those days, many schemes of agreement between the popish and reformed churches were exhibited by different authors. It appears by the xxixth of these letters published by Brown, that father Paul had some correspondence with the younger *Hotoman* upon this subject, concerning which, having observed, that the time was not favourable to a project of that kind, he adds, " I do believe that many of the differences " amongst us, are merely verbal, and they make me sometimes " laugh at them. Others of them there are that might be induced " without breaking any peace for them. And others there are that " might be easily composed. But the main of all is, that both parties are agreed in this, that they will not have them composed, " but think the disagreement irreconcileable.—Two contenders " will never agree, so long as there is in either of them any hopes " of getting the better; but where there is a certainty in both, that " they are in the right, there is no talking of agreement. Both " sides at this time hold it for certain that they shall get the better, " the one by divine means, the other by human." Every man may apply these authorities as he thinks good. I do not think

her, not only justifiable, but necessary. Both may agree that she does in fact deviate from her rule; but a question still remains between them, what those deviations are, and how far they make conformity to her ordinances sinful and criminal?

they will all do for the case of every scrupulous conformist, particularly not that which is taken from the imperfection of all human institutions, and is most absurdly urged by some, who would be thought to have no scruples, against any attempts at reformation at all. I do not know whence bishop Burnet had his account of the liberty father Paul took with the offices of his church, or whether bishop Bedell alludes to it where he says in the citation above, that "some by the favour they found where they lived, ob-"tained better conditions than others;" but this is certain, that Bedell himself was not disposed to allow any such conditions. "For "when a curate of another parish, being employed to read prayers "in his cathedral, added somewhat to the collects, the bishop ob-"serving he did this once or twice, went from his place to the rea-"der's pew, and took the book out of his hand, and in the hearing "of the congregation, suspended him for his presumption, and read "the rest of the office himself." Life, p. 145. Might not one say with truth, that bishop Bedell was, in this instance, less enlightened than father Paul? On the other hand, the account given by father Fulgentio, that "when, upon an intimation "that Pope Gregory XV. looked upon him to be an ob-"struction to the peace between the republic of Venice and the see "of Rome, father Pauld determined to retire out of the state of "Venice, he declined fixing his residence in a protestant country, "that he might not expose himself to calumnies;" which Mr. Lockman interprets to mean, lest he should be thought a convert to the protestant religion; and thereupon says, "How different is "bishop Burnet's account (quoted above) from that of father Ful-"gentio!" Life of Fa. Paul. xcvii. Probable arguments however might be brought to reconcile Fulgentio and Burnet. Fulgentio has taken no notice of any friendship or acquaintance between Bedell and father Paul. Can we conclude from hence, that there was none? The calumnies the father was afraid of, might be of the political as well as of the religious kind. Between the time when father Paul is said by Burnet, to think of retiring to England with Bedell, viz. 1607, to the accession of Gregory XV. 1621, is an interval of fourteen years, in which length

I do not apprehend, that the most zealous defenders of the established church are so perfectly agreed in the sense of particular scriptures, as to pronounce with united voice, how far any religious society of protestants among us, deviates from this capital rule in every instance. We must therefore necessarily differ, both with respect to the instances wherein even our own church is supposed to deviate, and with respect to the degree of blame, or if you will, of guilt, imputable to the church for persisting in such deviation.

If any one should affirm that we have men among us who would swear, subscribe to, and read any thing that should be prescribed to them, with the single view to the profits that may be annexed to the offices for which such compliances are the legal qualification, instead of contradicting him, I will only gently remind him, that there may be such men in civil as well as in ecclesiastical departments, and possibly in some ecclesiastical departments not understood to be established by law. But if any man should be so rash, or so void of candour, as to pass an indiscriminate censure upon

of time, the sentiments and circumstances of particular persons usually undergo great alterations. Fulgentio however takes notice, that the father came into some trouble for not repeating the *salve regina* at the end of the mass. I wish to have it understood, that these instances are not brought to furnish any sort of men with apologies or expedients of exculpation, to which they may possibly have no title; but to restrain, if possible, that spirit of judging one another, where the verdict neither is nor can be supported by sufficient evidence. And above all, to suggest, with all due deference to our superiors, that the same sort of exactions which gave offence and disquiet to wise and good men in communion with the church of Rome, can never do honour to a protestant church.

the conforming clergy, as if lucrative prospects were in general the motives of their entering upon, or continuing in their respective stations, he must be very imperfectly acquainted with the sentiments, the understandings, or the circumstances, of perhaps the most serious and ufeful part of them. Among these are numbers who have very different notions concerning human establishments of religion, and particularly concerning the forms and ordinances in our own. They who have their suspicions, or even a strong persuasion, that many things in them are wrong and ought to be reformed, may still have substantial reasons for not leaving their station in the church, and I will venture to name for *one*, the impossibility of their being in any degree so useful in any other.*

It seems to be a matter of indifference with these zealous and disinterested censors, who

* The *ufefulneſs* here meant, hath reſpect only to the paſtoral intercourſe of a miniſter with his pariſhioners. But there is another ſort of *ufefulneſs* perhaps of no leſs importance, which would be totally defeated, were the clergymen above deſcribed to reſign their cures, and which I cannot better expreſs than in the words of the maſterly writer of the Letters to a memberof Parliament above quoted. "Though this avowal of the principle which leads me," ſays this worthy perſon, "is, I think, a ſufficient anſwer to every peeviſh "call to reſign, yet there is a variety of conſiderations which ſhould "induce every friend of chriſtian liberty, at the preſent time, to "preſerve his influence in the church. The adverſary of refor-"mation would be glad to ſee ſuch a proof of our ſincerity as would "deſtroy our weight; but he is not entitled to ſo much conſidera-"tion. Indeed all the clergy may be conſidered as priſoners in a "common dungeon. The only difference between them is in the "degree of ſenſibility to the misfortune. But what ſhould we "think of an unfeeling fellow under ſentence of the law, who had "betrayed his companion by a want of ſpirit to reſiſt, and then "inſulted his misfortune, from a want of ſenſibility." *Letter* vii. p. 44.

would have every clergyman to leave the church, unless he is perfectly convinced that the church wants no reformation, that many hundreds by such secession might want bread to eat, and raiment to put on. They would probably tell the sufferers, that they are not to look at the temporal consequences of their self-denial, but leave their future provision to Providence. Such suggestions come with great ease from those who are not to be at the expence of maintaining these outcasts. But though that may be none of their concern, it certainly would become their candor and their charity, to point out the provinces in which these honest separatists might be equally useful, though not so fat and well liking, as they are in the church of England.

It would look invidious to pursue this subject as far as it would lead us. Whether these rigid casuists are orthodox churchmen, or rational dissenters, the dilemma might be brought home to themselves, by appealing to facts, which the candor of some, and the want of information in others, may have kept in obscurity. Recrimination is not the way to sow those grains of allowance (pardon the quibble) that might bring forth the amiable fruits of mutual forbearance, which all of us want in our turn.

In the mean time, the fact is, that numbers of our brethren remain in the church (whatever their motives may be) who have very different conceptions, concerning her established doctrines, and the forms by which the law obliges them to officiate. Concerning these, or at least a majority of them, I am persuaded, they

may do much more service in their respective stations, in a hundred instances, where neither the church nor the state would interfere with them, than they can do harm by their conformity, or than they can do good by separating from the church. And to these, I would willingly hope a few intimations to that purpose may neither be useless nor impertinent; leaving the rest to every man's conscience, and confiding that our superiors will in no long time be convinced, that so much of our church system as is worth supporting, will never be hurt by being established upon more equitable conditions.

The *second* of these discourses refers to an objection made to the christian religion, on account of the uncertainty of its doctrines, as they are differently represented by many eminent divines who have undertaken to explain them. This objection was the subject of a private correspondence between two persons, one of whom [the objector] had taken his ideas of the unanimity of the jews and mahometans, chiefly from the accounts given of them in the two little histories of Dr. Lancelot Addison.*

The conclusion is so little connected with the premises, and so evidently founded upon a false fact, that it is not worth any other confutation, than a bare reference to other authors who have given more accurate accounts of the sects and divisions among the jews and mahometans, than Dr. Addison had either inquired

* The one intitled. *The present state of the Jews, wherein is contained an exact account of their customs secular and religious.* The other, intitled, *The first state of Mahomedism, or an Account of the Author and Doctrines of that Imposture.*

after, or than he thought it necessary to mention in a little work, wherein he proposed to give only a general detail of what fell within his own observation.

It seemed to be of more consequence to obviate a position of a divine of our own country, (which the objector had brought by way of strengthening his argument) viz. that "it "was not necessary that christianity should "continue in the same state in which the "apostles left it." This being explained to mean, that it was necessary christianity should accommodate itself to the various policies which the states and kingdoms that received it should employ to promote their greatness and power respectively, implied such a mutability both in the doctrines and duties of christianity, as appears from the scriptures to be utterly inconsistent with the design, as well as the purity and simplicity of that gracious dispensation; and must create the utmost uncertainty among christians, what foundation they should have for their faith, or what rule for their manners.

Some people might possibly expect, that in a disquisition of this sort, an explicit answer should be returned to the question, *what is christianity?* and might say, that the answer here given to those writers who are for accommodating it to the turn and temper of the times, is rather shewing what christianity is not, than what it is.

But, let us proceed as far as we may upon sure grounds. *Est aliquid prodire tenus, si non detur ultrà.*

Grotius has observed, that "most people "think the whole christian religion consists in "what is professed among the party to which "they respectively adhere." If such people can be persuaded seriously and diligently to examine the writings pointed out to them as the only records in which the genuine account of true christianity is preserved, they will not only have the advantage of correcting their own party prejudices, but of getting a sufficient answer to the question, *what is Christianity ?*

I say, a *sufficient* answer; that is to say, an answer sufficient for *their own* satisfaction; such an answer as perhaps no man else could give for them.

Bishop Burnet hath said of the ever memorable Algernon Sidney, "that he seemed to be "a christian in a particular form of his own." I am of opinion, that this may be said of every man who reads the scriptures with a view of forming from thence an idea of true christianity; and I own I should be inclined to question the authenticity of that man's christianity, who professes to be a christian in *any* form that is *not* his own. The bishop tells us farther, "that Sidney thought christianity was to be "like a divine philosophy in the mind; but "was against all public worship, and every "thing that looked like a church."* Upon which it is remarked by the author of the memoirs prefixed to his discourses on government, that "though Mr. Sidney was an ene-"my to all civil establishments of christianity,

* Hift. O. T. fol. vol. i. p. 538.

" it does not follow from thence, that he was " against all public worship.* But perhaps had Sidney been examined upon this head himself, it might have turned out, that, in his opinion, this divine philosophy, imbibed and planted in the mind, by the study of the scriptures, was sufficient for salvation, abstracted from all consideration of public worship, or connection with a visible church ; an opinion which differs very little, if at all, from that which imports, that church membership is not necessary to salvation, and which is held at this day by some who are by no means to be suspected of heterodoxy.†

We are told in the life of Sir Philip Sidney, that just before his death, " he called unto him " the ministers, who were all excellent men, " of divers nations, and before them made " such a confession of christian faith as no " book but the heart can truly and feelingly " deliver."‡ These divines of divers nations, must also have been of divers sects or denominations of christians, and it would perhaps have been no easy matter to deliver a written creed that would have satisfied them all. Perhaps that was none of Sir Philip's care. He gave them one therefore, dictated by the *divine philosophy in his mind;* and died a *christain after a form of his own.* Algernon Sidney might possibly pay some regard to the religious sentiments of his noble kinsman, and adopt them as a family precedent.

* P. 28. of the folio edition of 1751.

† See bishop Warburton's Sermons, vol. ii. serm. xiii. on Luke ix. 49.

‡ Biographia Britannica. Sir Philip's Art. Rem. [R].

I might indeed have given Gregory Nazianzen's definition, *Christianity is the imitation of the divine nature.*‡ But a professed disputant would have known his business very imperfectly, if he had omitted to ask, what was meant by the *divine nature?* which might have led to a discussion of ten thousand opinions of philosophers and fathers, into which I have neither time nor inclination to enter.

St. James's definition was much nearer at hand. *Pure religion and undefiled before God, even the father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.* If any one should tell me, that the *charitable visitation* and *spotless life* here mentioned, are only the *fruits* of religion, and that we are still left to inquire by what doctrines or principles they are brought forth, I would chuse only to answer, *go thou and do likewise, and thou shalt know more of the doctrines*, both with respect to their origin and real meaning, than the greatest divine upon earth can exhibit, with all his definitions, axioms, and criticisms.

The *interests* of *religion*, the subject of the *third* of these discourses, is an expression to be met with in an hundred books, written with very different, and often contradictory views, all however upon the pretence of serving religion, and promoting its interests. Every donation to the church or churchmen; every superstitious ceremony intruded into the worship of God; every compulsive method of infor-

‡ χριστιανισμος ἐστι τησ θειασ φυσεως μιμησισ. It is the motto of Dr. Cudworth's sermon on 1 Cor. xv. 57. But perhaps was intended to be set before that on 1 John ii. 3, 4.

cing agreement in dogmatical propositions of artificial theology, have formerly been considered as proper means of advancing the *interests of religion;* and, if we may judge from the language of many in the present times who should know better, that mistaken idea is still retained, notwithstanding what the reformation may have done for us in other respects. The common people are but too apt to give into such notions as these, and should therefore be cautioned not to be imposed upon by a plausible term, which may lead them to hope, that they are promoting their own spiritual interest, while they are only forwarding the honour and profit of some particular society, whose regard for the true interests of religion may be but very faint, and remote from the more immediate object of their establishment.

The *last* discourse in this little collection, is meant for a vindication of those who have written or acted in favour of a reformation of the church, against an accusation, that they were endeavouring to subvert the ecclesiastical constitution of their country as by law established.

The merits of the objection, as well as of the defence, will depend upon the true answer to the questions, whether the civil magistrate, *professing himself a christian and a protestant,* hath a right to establish what religion he thinks fit, independently of any regard to the christian scriptures; and whether, in fact, the British magistrate considers himself as invested with any such power?

It is acknowledged, that the heathen magistrate, who had nothing to controul him but

the speculations of a few philosophic geniuses, to which he was not obliged to pay any regard, might establish all the superstitions of an idolatrous worship, at his pleasure, multiply the objects of it, and prescribe the belief of doctrines suitable to it, whenever he found it more convenient for the administration of his government. Mahomet likewise, being the author of a new sect, had a right, where he was acknowledged as the head of it, to establish what rites and doctrines he thought proper, and to inforce the observation of them by whatever penalties he judged might be most effectual for that purpose. The popish magistrate too, rejecting the scriptures as the rule and foundation of his establishment, consistently enough assumes to himself the right of adopting any doctrines, fictitious traditions, and idolatrous ceremonies, and of imposing them upon the people who admit his authority, by whatever kind of violence will best answer his ends. There is nothing in the doctrines of any of these religions to check the spirit of superstition and intolerance, or the influence of fraud and imposture in any degree.

But the christian and protestant magistrate is limited to a narrower province. In matters of religion the christian scriptures are *his* rule, as well as that of his people, and the observance of that rule, in establishing religion by law, is a fundamental condition of his authority. Whenever therefore there is in his system of religion any essential deviation from this rule, an attempt to bring it back to its acknowledged foundation, can be no derogation to his authority, which *ex hypothesi*, is

none when he adopts a different rule of establishing religion than his own principles of government will admit of.*

The great advocate, † for the unlimited power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion, thinks he says a great deal when he affirms, in aid of his argument, that "it is scarce "possible to name or invent an opinion more "absurd in its self, or more hurtful to society, "or more fatal to the cause of piety and vir-"tue, than many of those which have been "actually maintained by men who called "themselves christians."

* "I am aware," says a judicious writer, "of the strength of all "those political pleas for our present forms, which proceed upon the "strange principle, that the magistrate has a right to connect him-"self with that sect of religionists which happens to be the largest, "in order to carry on the business of government with the greatest "facility. I call this principle strange, not as seeing it in the same "light with our opponents, for their view is consistent enough. "They consider the magistrate as determined in favour of one set "of opinions, by attending only to his political interest, or his pow-"er; while we consider him, not only as a political, but as a religi-"ous being, who is to be determined in favour of truth by a regard "to moral interest. Upon their view any religion is entituled by "its majority to his alliance; but upon our's, christianity must be "his choice if he be a christian, as he will answer for that choice; "and the bible only must be his standard, if he be a protestant, (or "in other words, has declared against the interpretations of men) "and would wish to be consistent." *Letters, &c. ut supra, p.* 43. The author of an *Essay on Establishments in Religion*, seems not to have had the remotest idea of these obligations of the christian and protestant magistrate. His system was formed on the plan of the *book of alliance*, in which the *church* and its *utilities*, were substituted for *truth* and the *bible*. But it did not so well become Dr. Balguy to pass by this *constitutional* view of the British establishment of religion in silence, as these excellent letters were published some months before his memorable charge was delivered. It is not a compliment to a particular writer in a high station, that will excuse this contemptuous disregard of so important a consideration as is suggested in the passage above cited.

† Dr. Balguy.

Very true; and not only *maintained*, but *established* by men who called themselves *christian magistrates;* and who consequently have had the power of doing ten thousand times more mischief with them than could be done by any private wronghead, or by any sect of wrongheads, whose opinions the sober conscientious christian was at full liberty to oppose and reject, without the peril of losing life or limb, or being excluded from the reasonable and lawful means of his subsistence.

But this is not the place to enlarge upon this subject. While Dr. Benjamin Dawson's excellent letter to the clergy of the archdeaconry of Winchester, and the no less excellent *plea of the petitioners stated and vindicated*, remain unanswered, no competent judge of the controversy will envy the author of the discourse which occasioned these two tracts, the compliments that may have been paid him, as the finisher of the debate, and the irrefragable champion of the PROTESTANT CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

FOUR DISCOURSES.

DISCOURSE I.

On the duty of a christian minister under the obligation of conforming to a national religion, established by the civil powers.

THE wisdom of human governments is then most evidently and effectually justified, when the duties allotted to the different classes of its subjects, are laid out upon such plans, and inforced by such regulations, as have the most immediate tendency to promote the safety, benefit, and felicity of the whole community. Among others, the province of those who have been appointed to instill the principles, and to cultivate the influence of religion upon the minds of the people, has ever been esteemed of especial importance. Such an order of men, to fulfil their original designation, must of course be concerned for, and connected with persons of every rank and station, and under a particular obligation to recommend the practice of virtue, and to furnish expedients of social peace and order, upon principles and considerations, which go deeper than the encouragement of temporal rewards, or the terror of present punishments have been found to reach.

But though this has been the general, and almost the universal notion of the utility of such a body of men as the clergy, even so long as religion and civil government have been thought necessary, not only for the welfare, but for the very existence of civil society, yet nothing, upon examination, will be found more discordant than this theory, when compared with the corrupt practice of ancient governments in the uses they made of religious institutions, and of the men who officiated in the public ministrations of them.

The wisdom of God comprised the whole jewish system, both of civil and ecclesiastical polity, in the same code of laws, without any confusion however, or any interference of either department with the other. But though these provinces were kept sufficiently distinct in the infancy of the hebrew republic, yet in process of time, there were considerable deviations from the original plan, as may be seen in the scripture-history of this people, insomuch that in the decline of their national strength and importance, the respective provinces of their civil and ecclesiastical magistrates were so confounded, as not only to obstruct the course of civil justice, but likewise to preclude all the real benefit and edification which was originally intended by the institution of their religious ordinances.*

* Jer. v. 31. For what happened after the captivity, see LOWMAN on the civil government of the hebrews, p. 235. Ij homines [Levitæ sc.] summam potestatem nacti, rempublicam quidem ditissimam maximamque fecere, sed ipsi inter se, dum de imperio, honoribus, gloria certabant, divina et humana promiscua habuere. Ita nihil ad pietatem modestiamque illis sanctissimum nomen religionis

The heathen magistrates were so sensible of the political uses to which their religion might be adapted, that they took upon themselves, not only the establishment of the public ritual, but the inspection and controul of the priests and other religious ministers, in the use of it, and prescribed from time to time, such variations in the public service, even with respect to the objects of public worship, as either the exigencies of government, or the temporary superstition of the people might seem to require.

It is evident that this interposition of the civil magistrate, must make the priest a merely political character. By such a minister, a better sort of religion than that of the pagans, could not be taught upon any permanent principle of truth and reason, as the principle could not always be accommodated to the supposed exigencies of the state; and if, in contemplation of the principle, the priest had deviated from the prescribed methods of his ministry, his office would have been immediately superseded, and the man himself treated as a factious and seditious disturber of the public repose.*

profuit, quos ex cæterorum civium communione selegerat sibi seposueratque olim Deus, uti inter sacra ceremoniasque procul ambitione, ætatem agerent. *Cunæus de rep. hebr. lib.* 1. *cap.* xv. p. iii.

* Cum multa divinitus, pontifices, a majoribus nostris inventa atque instituta sunt, tum nihil præclarius, quam quod vos eosdem et religionibus Deorum immortalium, et summæ republicæ præesse voluerunt; ut amplissimi et clarissimi cives rempublicam bene gerendo, pontifices religiones sapienter interpretando, rempublicam conservarent. *Cic. pro domo. initio.* *P. Manutius*, in a note upon this passage, would have us believe this was more than a compliment to the pontiffs for the time being; and that it had been so from the beginning. But Manutius was a zealous papist, and by this means, got a precedent for his own pontiff's temporal dominion. Dr. Pot-

The high-priesthood was in the jewish as well as the heathen governments, frequently in the hands of the supreme minister of civil justice, the consequence of which would be, an implicit obedience to his will, not only of the priests and ministers of the lower orders, but of the body of the people; and this, being the product of a slavish fear, would leave no room for the exercise of reason and liberal reflection, and consequently no distinction in the mind of the superstitious religionist, overawed by his reverence for the ecclesiastical character, between the genuine principles of piety and virtue, and the dictates of impiety and sensual

ter informs us from Plato, that the same was the case at Athens, and most of the Grecian cities. "In Egypt," says the same learned man, "the kings were all priests." *Arch. Græc.* 1764. vol. 1. p. 203. Hence some have imagined, that Moses, *Exod.* xix. 6. borrowed the idea of a *kingdom of priests*, when the Israelites in general should be so far beyond the Ægyptians in dignity, that every man should be a priest, and every priest a king. In the LXX. it is Βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, *a royal priesthood*, the very term used by *St. Peter*, 1 Ep. ii. 9. and appropriated to his fellow-christians. Which passage, taken along with that, Rev. i. 6. cannot, however, be applied to christians in the same respects as it was to the Jews; as hath been well observed by Grotius, who supposeth it to allude to the privilege every Israelite had of sacrificing the Paschal lamb, without the aid of a Levitical priest. Many wild things have been inferred from this text, by enthusiasts of different denominations; nor have men of more learning and sobriety been of the same mind in their interpretations of it. The popish commentators, and some also of our own elder divines, have been superabundantly cautious, that *common christians* should take no encouragement from this text to encroach upon the clerical province, derived, as they say, from the apostles. But let the civil magistrate look to that, so far as forms and externals are concerned. The commonest christian among us may lawfully derive from this text an *internal independency*, *a sovereignty of conscience*, with respect to what he hath to offer to God, whether matters of faith or worship, and in this sense, EVERY CHRISTIAN IS HIS OWN PRIEST.

appetite, when either happened to be the object of any religious institution.*

In this state of political subordination, our blessed Saviour found the religion both of the jews and gentiles, and consequently without any, or at least with a very small portion of its proper influence upon the human mind; nor is it at all wonderful, that his divine commission should imply, that religion could not be re-

* Concerning the high-prieſthood among the heathens, the fact is out of diſpute. Dr. Prideaux informs us, that at the time that Menelaus purchaſed the high-prieſthood over Jaſon's head, 2 *Maccab.* iv. 26. "the high-prieſt of the Jews had then, and for ſome ages "paſt, the ſole temporal government of his nation, firſt under the "Perſian, and afterwards under the Macedonian kings." *Connection, part.* ii. *b.* iii. *p.* 161. edit. 1718. It is an inſignificant diſtinction that the learned hiſtorian there makes, viz. "that the tem-"poral power was derived from the king, and the eccleſiaſtical from "divine authority." It is plain the whole compounded power was purchaſed of the king, and the corrupt purchaſer would without doubt, when the exigencies of his temporal government required it, make the eccleſiaſtical ſyſtem ſubſervient to the political without any ſcruple. And it is probable that, for this purpoſe, many of the arbitrary traditions mentioned in the new teſtament, (*Mark* vii. 4. 8.) had their beginning in theſe times. The idolatrous corruptions in the jewiſh worſhip, were of earlier date, and the effect undoubtedly of the ſuperſtition of their own monarchs, who had the prieſts under their command, and by ſome means or other, influenced them to comply with their idolatrous rites; and when the conſcientious part of them refuſed to conform, they appointed others of different tribes of a more pliable diſpoſition. See 1 Kings, xii. 31. xiii. 33. 2 Chron. xi. 14, 15. xiii. 9. 10, 11. But there was another claſs of men, who, under the political managements of their wicked kings, were acceſſaries to their corruptions in the *weightier matters of the law*, as the time-ſerving prieſts were in ritual worſhip. Theſe were their prophets, the preachers of moral doctrine among the people, as well as meſſengers of good and evil. It appears from the hiſtory of the old teſtament, that the prophets were conſidered as counſellors of ſtate, even the true prophets to their good kings. And to this uſe likewiſe were their falſe prophets put by their wicked kings, as appears from the hiſtory of Ahab (1 Kings, xxii. 2 Chron. xviii.) who had no fewer than four hundred of them in his ſervice.

stored to its natural and original energy, otherwise than by putting the preachers and ministers of it under very different obligations from those, under which their jewish and gentile superiors had laid them.

And therefore, as our Lord came into the world to *bear witness unto the truth*, and to preach and propagate the gospel of truth among people of all ranks and denominations, without any regard to the carnal prejudices or the political interests of the powers of this world, he chose his preachers and ministers out of a sort of men who were strangers to the intrigues and refinements of human policy, and who, though they were full of the expectation of a temporal Messiah, would be the more easily weaned from this prepossession, in consideration, that persons in their low condition, and of their slender accomplishments, could form no very sanguine hopes of being much more distinguished, or much better provided for, in consequence of any national revolution, than they were in their present situation. Their adherence to this mistaken expectation so long, appears to have been occasioned by their suggesting to themselves, that, being chosen by Jesus to be his disciples and intimate friends, in preference to others of more eminent talents, they might have pretensions to honours and rewards in this new kingdom, to which they could not have aspired, under the government of any person with whom they had no such connection, and from whom their station and circumstances set them at a greater distance. They were, however, easily cured of this prejudice, when they came to understand, that

they were the companions, not of a triumphant, but of a suffering Messiah, whom the powers of this world would treat with contempt and cruelty, and in the event with capital execution; and would be much sooner reconciled to their disappointment, than men whose conversation and acquaintance with the world at large, had taught them to put a greater value upon the honours and profits of a superior station.

At the same time that they had this account of the humiliation of their lord and master, they were told, that they were to succeed to his ministry with the same sufferings in their view, and with the same enmity from kings and magistrates, and the ruling powers of this world, wherever they should be called or allotted to discharge their commission.

Our Saviour's instructions to them, with respect to their preaching and propagating his gospel, prepared them for these trials, and their conduct and practice afterwards shewed, that they had profited by his admonitions. And thus all connection of this new dispensation with the political views and interests of secular authority, were entirely broken. The preachers of the gospel were not to stay for the permission of civil governors to enter upon their province, or to take directions from them what doctrines they should teach, or at what times or places, or under what restrictions. The maxim that GOD, in these things, *was to be obeyed, and not man*, was a full exemption from this kind of dependence. And lest this appeal from human authority might give occasion to stigmatise them with the imputation

of factious and seditious designs, their commandment was, to be the servants of all, to recommend the word of truth to the universal acceptance of the whole race of mankind by their own innocence and humility, by their disinterested charity, their unwearied diligence in preaching peace and love, as well as truth, and finally to shew by their example as well as doctrine, that the kingdom to which they were employed to gain subjects, was not a kingdom of this world.

In whatever other respects the pastors of christian churches in the present times, may be called the successors of the apostles, they certainly succeed them in this part of their obligation, that is to say, in the obligation to preach the word of God in truth and in sincerity, unawed by the powers of this world, and uninfluenced by the hope or fear of present reward or punishment; the same word which Christ himself preached, and his disciples have recorded, unadulterated with the subtile refinements and fictitious comments of vain and interested men, and without any other respect to the ordinances of man, than as they tend to promote the common edification of the christian brotherhood, and to answer the original design of the preachers office, of bringing all men *to the knowledge of the truth*, and by that means to everlasting life.

The rules and directions we have on this head, cannot be mistaken. Our Lord hath warned us of the consequences of being *ashamed of him, or of his words*, and of the fate of timid, slothful, and unprofitable servants. His

apostles continued the same admonitions. *Let a man so account of us*, says St. Paul, *as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. Morever it is required of stewards, that a man be found faithful.** And of the circumstances of this fidelity, he gives the following account. *Therefore, seeing we have received this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not, but have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.*† On other occasions he disclaims for himself, and consequently for all faithful ministers of the gospel, all considerations of *pleasing men*,‡ all views of *filthy lucre*,§ all *dominion over the faith* of the christian flock,¶ and in one word, all regards to the interests and advantages of the present world, so far as they interfered with his prospect of *finishing his course with joy*, when he should be called to give a final account of his important stewardship.

If we now reflect, in what manner the histo

* 1 *Cor* iv. 1. 2. Cum doctrina christiana sit *catholica*, nulla habet *mysteria*, hoc est dogmata vel præcepta quæ non omnibus inculcari debeant, vocantur tamen *mysteria*, vel respectu illorum hominum qui ante tempora patefacti evangelii vixerunt, vel respectu illorum, qui tum quidem vivebant, sed suis vitiis atque præjudicatis opinionibus, aures obturabant quo minus audire atque intelligere possent. *Wetstein. in Matth.* xiii. 11. See *the Apology of Benjamin Ben Mordecai, for embracing christianity*. Lett. vii. p. 161—164.

† 2 *Cor.* iv. 2. Whatever the word mysteries may be supposed to mean in the text above cited, we see the duty of the christian steward is to make them manifest.

‡ *Gal.* i. 10.—§ *Acts* xx. 33.—2 *Cor.* xii. 17.

¶ 2 *Cor.* i. 24

ry of the christian church represents this example of the apostles to have been observed in subsequent times, and particularly how soon after christianity obtained a settlement under the civil power, secular views and interests were, on various pretences, intermixed with its nobler ends and tendencies, and with what evil effects the same worldly spirit has wrought upon its professed patrons and protectors, from the earliest times of its establishment to this hour; whoever, I say, reflects upon this, can hardly be insensible of the difficulties that must beset and incumber the conscientious minister of the gospel, who is desirous to discharge his trust with that fidelity and singleness of heart, which, as appears by the passages I have just referred to, make so considerable a part of his scriptural character.

Let us consider the case with that attention which the importance of it deserves.

And here, without entering into a particular detail of the progress of corruption in the christian church, it will be sufficient to refer you to the state and complexion of popery immediately before the protestant reformation took place. You will find, not only the corruptions and impostures which the weak or wicked rulers of the church had pretended to derive from the records and documents of the religion they professed, and which had been increasing for fourteen hundred years, centering in the popish system, but you will perceive in that system a number of others of mere pagan original, contrived, as it should seem,

to defeat the purposes, and extinguish the vital powers of christianity, even to a greater degree than the superstition of the pagans could, of itself, have operated : inasmuch as by the hypocrisy and artful policy of the conductors of the project, it became extremely difficult to distinguish the genuine principles and doctrines of the christian dispensation, from the arbitrary, fictitious, and idolatrous ordinances which had been imposed upon the deluded people under the mask of apostolical tradition, and consequently of apostolical authority.

They who first opposed these corruptions, and contended for the necessity of a reformation of the church, plainly perceived, that this tyranny of ecclesiastical governors, and the subjection of persons in all stations and of all degrees to their dictates and ordinances, were wholly owing to the ignorance of the people in general of what was taught in the scriptures, which had been partly kept out of their reach, and partly discredited and undervalued by a degrading comparison of their authority with that of the church so called.*

* When the Huſſites at the council of Baſil, ſaid, that " they " would receive no doctrine which was not contained in the holy " ſcriptures," they were anſwered by Cardinal *Cuſanus*, *Scripturas non ad* ESSE, *ſed ad* BENE ESSE *Eccleſiæ facere, tanto dignius verbum Dei tradi, quanto ab omni ſcriptura remotius. Explicandam ſcripturam eſſe juxta currentem eccleſiæ ritum, quâ ſententiam mutante, Dei etiam judicium mutetur.* See Dan. Gerdes' *Hiſt. Evang. Renovat.* tom. i. p. 32. who cites Cuſanus's 7th epiſtle to the Bohemians. *Heidegger*, *Hiſt. Papatus*, p. 180. cites the ſame words. And Mr. Bayle, article BALDUS, Rem. (I.) has more to the ſame purpoſe from theſe epiſtles of *Cuſanus*; and adds, *I love this plain dealing.* *Mr. Serces*, in his book intituled, *Popery an enemy to ſcripture*, has many inſtances of this degradation and contempt of the ſcriptures among the popiſh writers;

Accordingly the groundwork on which the early reformers proceeded, was to fix the written word of God for the rule and standard of whatever was to be taught or practised by christians, either in their public assemblies, or their more private exercises of piety and charity, with no farther regard to any ordinances prescribed by a different authority, than was immediately conducive to the common edification of the brotherhood.

The first movers, indeed, of a separation from the roman church, do not seem to have been aware of a circumstance, which occurred to their successors, in their progress to a final settlement, namely, the necessity of forming some mode of ecclesiastical government for protestant churches, in which scripture doctrines were to be publicly taught and professed, and public worship celebrated. The question was, whether the scriptures afforded sufficient directions for the particulars of such government, inforced by such discipline as all bodies of men in social union seemed to require?

To this question it was answered, that general directions for the administration of eccle-

but these instances are most of them posterior to the dawnings of the reformation, and many of them to the council of Trent: what is here proposed is, to shew the sense of the church of Rome, when she was in full security, and in no apprehension of being attacked, as she afterwards was by Luther and his followers. Du Plessis, *Myst. Iniq. progression* 62. says, *Mandatum Cardinali Cusano ut per literas hoc axioma* [the axiom of the Hussites, nullum dogma extra sacram scripturam admittendum] *contunderet.* So that we see the doctrine above-cited was not Cusanus's private opinion, but the sense of the council. Du Plessis cites other passages from these letters of Cusanus, besides those above-mentioned, to the same effect.

siastical government were clearly laid down in holy writ; but not with the precision necessary for all occasions and exigencies; that it was therefore proper, that a discretionary power should be trusted with particular churches in matters of this sort, under that general precept of St. PAUL, *let all things be done decently and in order.*

There were, however, among them, many who foresaw where this discretionary power would end, namely, either in usurpations of undue authority, or in perpetual feuds and contests, concerning what was *decent* and *orderly*; and they remonstrated accordingly, strongly representing, that as soon as men should deviate from the simplicity of primitive worship, and the moderation of apostolical government (of both which they asserted, there were clear and sufficient precedents in the New Testament) their disagreement about the rites to be established, and the discipline necessary to inforce the observance of them, would give rise to a coercive authority, which, under the pretence of procuring uniformity, would impose the same sort of bondage upon them, that they refused to bear under the dominion of the church of Rome.*

* *Flacius Illyricus*, however he may have suffered in his reputation for opposing Melancthon's concessions to the romanists in matters of this nature, was neither so wrong in his judgment, nor so singular in his opposition, as to be either without a justification in the events he foresaw, or to stand alone in the contest. Melancthon wished to have bishops established, and thought there could be no ecclesiastical polity without them; but was still for preserving evangelical liberty in matters of doctrine. But they who saw the little probability there was of this (taking their account from the use the bishops of those days made of their power) said, that "he [Melanct-

But the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. It

" hon] could not have done a more considerable service to the popish " cause, if he had received a sum of money for pleading for it." *Adam. vit. Melancth.* p. 335. See also *Melancthon's letters to Camerarius, epist.* l. 4.—99, 104, 106. *et alibi passim.* After some trial, he was obliged to give up his project. *ibid.* p. 836. *Melancthon* was likewise for retaining a number of popish ceremonies, as *adiaphorous*, or things indifferent; at the same time he acknowledged, that, upon protestant principles, they were marks of servility. *Illyricus* was not the only one who opposed him in this matter. How unwilling particular protestant churches were to come into this proposal, appears from the epistles Melancthon and his coadjutors wrote to the churches of *Nuremberg, Stetin, Hamburgh*, the *Marche* of *Brandenburgh, Mansfeld*, and *Francford.* And to say the truth, the casuistry he made use of to reconcile these people to his *adiaphorism*, does no great credit either to his judgment, or his ingenuity. *Vid. Epist.* l. 1. p. 92—108. Lond. 1642. His defence against *Illyricus* (*ibid.* p. 133) is, in some respects, even pitiable. He is driven to say, that he was not always in earnest, that he often argued against his own opinion, and that he was much given to joking. The fact is, that this doctrine of *Adiaphorism* caused a considerable defection from Melancthon and his party, after the death of Luther, when Melancthon, according to Mosheim, made a more open profession of this doctrine, than he ventured to do in Luther's life-time. Quæ quidem omnia efficiebant, says Mosheim, ut eo [Melancthone] principatum inter theologos lutheranos tenente, ecclesia pacem illam, qua sub LUTHERO usa erat, amitteret, atque multarum et acerrimarum turbarum, et disputationum scena quodammodo fieret. *Instit. Hist. Eccles. Helmstad*, 1764, p. 655. The certain consequences of all trimming expedients, which Luther abominated. Melancthon has been much commended for his meek and healing spirit, and Grotius says he infused it into his disciples. *Melancthonis ac Johannis Arndi* discipulos ferme videas bonos ac lenes; contra Calvini asperos, et tales quales in maximam partem humani generis Deum esse sibi imaginantur. *Vot. pro pace.* ed. Lond. fol. 1679, p. 656. Grotius, who had his use for Melancthon's concessions in favour of popery, had a great advantage in setting him besides the rigid Calvin, though Rivet observes, pertinently enough, that Grotius was neither *bonus* nor *lenis* in characterising the body of the calvinists in those terms. *Apologeticus, Lugd. Bat.* 1643, p. 50. And when Grotius attempts to account for Melancthon's lenity in approving Calvin's dealings with Servetus, he comes but poorly off. Moshe-

was easy to discern, to what strength and power the romish church had arrived by the means of her mode of government. Popery was the avowed enemy of the reformers, and opposed them to great advantage with a body so compacted by government and discipline: and we can hardly wonder, that the weaker protestant party should begin to be in fear for their own system, and to apprehend its speedy declension, except they could cement it by something similar or equivalent to the bonds which kept the adversary firm and unbroken, under all the attacks made upon them by the reformers.

This consideration threw them into the protection, and by natural consequence, into a

im's character of Melanchon is worth notice. Mortuo LUTHERO, PHIL. MELANCTHON caput et princeps Theologorum ecclesiæ Lutheranæ fiebat, vir sine dubio magnus et egregius, verum Luthero multis rebus inferior, maxime vero animi robore, fortitudine atque auctoritate. Mollis enim erat, pacis et tranquillitatis præter omnem modum amans; timidus, potentiorum indignationem et iram formidans, denique is, qui amorem sibi quidem et benevolentiam comparare, non vero novarum rerum et sententiarum auctores, terrere atque metu in officio continere atque comprimere posset. u. s. After which Mosheim proceeds to relate, what ample concessions he would have made to the church of Rome. Illyricus was doubtless inexcusable for his intemperate zeal; but who knows to what concessions Melanchon's timidity would have carried him, if he had not been so sharply attacked for those he had made? No man could have answered, how far he would have gone towards complying with the whole *interim*, step by step. He was, *out of all measure*, studious of peace and tranquility, and had he, from that propensity, accepted of the *interim*, what would have become of the reformation? It is not unreasonable to ask these questions, if we only consider, that Melanchon thought the authority [*Imperium*] of the pope might be submitted to on certain conditions, for peace sake, and with a reserve to such truths as were clearly propounded in the holy scriptures. Mosheim, p. 655. The question would presently have been, who must be the judge of this clearness? And the answer was obvious, he who was acknowledged to have the *Imperium*.

dependence upon the civil powers which espoused or countenanced their separation from Rome, and which, at the first, afforded them their patronage so far, as to defend them from the persecution of their popish adversaries, without much interfering with their methods of propagating the protestant religion, or those regulations by which the public worship was conducted.*

In process of time, differences and contentions arising in protestant congregations, the prevailing party found it convenient to apply to the civil powers, for a legal and exclusive establishment of such doctrines and forms of worship, as they had respectively espoused; by which, in all such instances. a political connection was once more created between the church and state, which must of course have a considerable influence upon those ministerial functions annexed to the province of the clergy. In this situation of things, the stipends of ministers, and other emoluments of honour and profit, were insured to the church by the authority of the civil magistrate, and some of the more important actually conferred by him. And it can be no wonder, (the infirmities and corruptions of human nature considered) that there should be candidates for the ministry, who would have their eye upon these emoluments, more than upon the evangelical duties

* One instance of this we have in Bayle's Dictionary, viz. of *Lotichius*, Abbot of *Solitar*, in the county of *Hanaw*, who openly established the protestant religion in his monastery, and in all places depending upon it, in the year 1543. See his article. Mr. Bayle adds, Lotichius was the principal cause of the couragious resolution, which the neighbouring ministers took to reject the *Interim* in 1549,

of their calling, and in many instances, be more careful to examine what was the sense of their immediate benefactors concerning the doctrines and ordinances of religion, than what was prescribed in the written record of the commands of a Lord and Master, whose promises referred his servants for their reward to a future and a remote period.

The inconveniences arising from the merely political uses of religion, and from the compliance of the teachers of it with them, have been pointed out and complained of, as great obstructions to the free course of the word of God, by many pious, eminent, and learned divines in different protestant churches. Nor is it to be expected that our own church should be exempted from an evil which has its source in the common affections of the human mind. Upon the particular objects of these complaints I shall not dwell, referring those who desire to see what difficulties and embarrassments they lay in the way of a faithful minister of the gospel, to bishop Burnet's excellent treatise on the Pastoral Care, and the considerations offered by the same worthy prelate on the same subject, in the conclusion of the history of his own times. And these things appearing now only in the light of temptations, which we may and ought to resist; and the moderation of the civil magistrate having discouraged all methods of force and compulsion, and thereby loosened many of the unedifying restraints upon the clergy of the establishment, as well as others, I shall only for the present, suggest the uses we ought to make of the liberty we have, consistently with the respect we owe to our supe-

riors under whom we enjoy it, till the happy time shall come, when whatever may have even the appearance of an incumbrance upon the free course of the word of God, shall be effectually taken away.

Upon whatever terms, or by whatever authority we receive our office, if we take it upon us *willingly*, and of *a ready mind*, we should consider ourselves as under an indispensable obligation to that heavenly master whose stewards we are, prior to any stipulations with any particular society which calls itself christian. No such society indeed can, upon its own principles, justly require either more or less in matters of religion, than our sovereign head and governor hath prescribed in that revelation of his will, which his providence hath handed down to us in the holy scriptures. To this doctrine the church of England bears her testimony in several of her solemn forms, and in that particularly, by which our office is conferred.

In these circumstances, to be influenced in our public ministrations, by the hope of pleasing, or the fear of displeasing the powers of this world, must subject us to an account which we cannot think of giving with joy and satisfaction, if the Apostles of Christ have faithfully and truly stated the conditions on which they received their commission.

Simplicity and *godly sincerity* in preaching the gospel, are the qualifications upon which the Apostle Paul chiefly values himself; and these he opposes to *fleshly wisdom*, to *hypocrisy*, to *merchandising* or *trafficking* with the word of God and to a view *of pleasing men*, or what

he calls *preaching himself; commending himself*, as he expresses it, *to every man's conscience in the sight of God.*

What the apostle meant by *sincerity*, could hardly be made more intelligible by words, than it is by this contrast; and yet, strange as it may be thought, there are men among us who seem to be very unwilling to understand it in this plain sense, insisting, that it is an insufficient principle to justify either teachers or hearers, when, in certain cases, it comes in competition with human authority, which they think fit to say, takes place of all private convictions, (even such as arise from studying the sacred writings) under the general directions of obedience to government.

But however the particular advocates for this doctrine may avail themselves of the advantages they derive from it, it is a doctrine which no christian and protestant church, that I know of, hath hitherto ventured to avow. It is taken for granted in them all, that whatever forms of doctrine of human composition have been received among them, as standards of orthodoxy, were drawn up by men, who were sincerely persuaded that they were agreeable to the word of God, and who procured the establishment of them upon that only consideration. And that being presupposed, they could never intend to exclude their successors from acting upon the same principle, when the province of teaching devolved upon them, notwithstanding the different light in which the passages of scripture alledged by them in support of the established system, might appear to their posterity; an event which, con-

scious as they were of their own fallibility, they might easily foresee would certainly happen.*

* I know the sincerity of those who revised the Common Prayer-book at the restoration of king Charles II. has been called in question, and perhaps upon some plausible grounds. It was said, that they had it in their view rather to distress the dissenters, than to conform the liturgical services to the terms of the word of God; and I own there is a note subjoined by Dr. Nicholls to their Preface, which seems to give countenance to this surmise. "It is inconceivable," says the doctor, "what difficulties the bishops at that time had "to contend with about making the alterations. They were not "only *to conquer their own former resentments, and the quick re-*"*membrance of their sufferings*, together with the unreasonable de-"mands of the presbyterian party, but they had the court to deal "with likewise, who pushed on to all acts of severity, but were wil-"ling to let the odium thereof lie upon the clergy. And by the "management of some great persons then in power, the minds of "the episcopal clergy, and zealous conformists, were so wrought up, "upon the talk of these alterations, that the bishops who were con-"cerned in them, found it a difficult matter to manage the temper of "their friends. This is but a poor defence of these bishops. It represents them as, in some degree, the captives of their own resentments, and the tools and dupes of an iniquitous and tyrannical court, and tends to induce a suspicion of their insincerity in making those alterations which were established with the rest of our liturgical forms by the Bartholomew act. It is but reasonable however, that the bishops should be heard in their own cause, and thus they plead it. "Having thus endeavoured to discharge our duties in this weighty "affair, as *in the sight of God*, and to prove our *sincerity* therein "(so far as lay in us) to the *consciences of all men*; although we "know it impossible (in such variety of apprehensions, humours, and "interests, as are in the world) to please all; nor can expect that "men of factious, peevish, and perverse spirits should be satisfied "with any thing that can be done in this kind by any other than "themselves; yet we have good hope that what is here presented, "and hath been by the convocations of both provinces with great "diligence examined and approved, will be also well accepted and "approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of "the church of England." *Preface to the Common Prayer Book.* When men make such solemn appeals to God for their sincerity in his sight, they risque too much of their justification upon a future judgment, to be subject to man's judgment in this world: I shall therefore only remark, that if they were really sincere in this weighty

But we have still better evidence of the limitations put upon human authority in matters of this nature, in the writings of the apostles.

St. Paul writing to the Philippians (and by the way, addressing his epistle to the bishops and deacons as well as the congregation at large) prays, that *their love may abound more and more in knowledge and in all judgment, to the end that they might approve, or try things that are excellent*,* that is to say, that they might be able to judge in what respect things that are excellent differ from things of inferior value.

But this *knowledge* and *understanding* were not then, any more than now, to be acquired otherwise than by examination, and by comparing the things that were to be distinguished, one with another, with impartiality and fidelity, and without trusting to the opinions or determinations of others, who had gone before them; and for what purpose? even the very important one, that they might be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ, which, it is implied, they could not be, without thus exercising their understanding and judgment in such disquisitions.†

And if this rule takes every intelligent christian, much more does it take every minister of the gospel out of the hands of overruling-authority. Human authority may determine things to be more excellent, which a

affair, neither their own resentments, nor the authority of the court had any share in their counsels or resolutions.

* Philippians i. 9, 10.

† See *Elsner. observ. sacr.* upon these two verses, and upon Rom. ii. 18.

man who exercises his knowledge and judgment, may perceive to be less excellent even than some other things which human authority may undervalue, perhaps reprobate and condemn as erroneous and heretical. To take the decision of others in such cases, where our own examination and proof is so expressly made our duty, is to act that insincere and offensive part, which must expose the credulous or indolent teacher to the sentence of the slothful servant who hid his Lord's talent, (entrusted to him for the purposes of improvement) when the Lord of that teacher cometh and reckoneth with him.

Where the spirit of the Lord is, says the same apostle, *there is liberty*. And by plain consequence, where liberty is not, the spirit of the Lord will not be. The man who gives up his spiritual liberty, taketh unto himself other impure spirits, with which the spirit of the Lord disdains to associate, such as the unmanly spirit of timidity, the self-seeking spirit of worldly discretion, the abject spirit of adulation, the sordid spirit of avarice, the domineering spirit of ambition, and too often the corrupt and contagious spirit of sensual pleasure.

It is much to be regretted, that they who undertook to establish protestant churches in different countries of Europe, by civil sanctions, should not have been a little more attentive to the nature and genius of the christian religion, which their own principles, if adhered to, would have suggested to them, was then the most efficacious, when professed and practised with its native moderation, and in its

native simplicity. The beginnings of the reformation were indeed attended in all these countries with great difficulties, and violent struggles with powerful adversaries. But calmer times succeeded, when, if due regard had been paid to the healing dictates of christianity, many of those evils and scandals might have been avoided, which give a serious reader of those histories pain and disgust.

The civil powers who espoused the protestant religion, seem, in their provisions for peace and order in their respective churches, to have been too apprehensive of the disturbances which they supposed a more enlarged toleration of private judgment would have produced. They did not foresee that the establishment of one system of doctrine, and one mode of worship, with so undue a preference, and so many superior advantages above the rest, would necessarily foment those divisions which they intended to avoid; and drive them at length, in their pursuit of an ideal uniformity, into those very unchristian measures of coercion which had been the objects of their abhorrence in the church of Rome, and none of the least justifiable motives they had for coming out of her.

Experience, and the free discussion of the grounds of christian liberty, has given us a more distinct view of the mistakes of our predecessors, some of which have accordingly been rectified. But more still remains to be done, and it is to be feared will remain, till the civil powers feel the inconveniences of confining christian edification by political covenants, which prevent even the state from re-

ceiving the benefits that a more diffusive encouragement of the *conscientious principle* among its subjects, would unquestionably derive upon it.

I enter not into the controversy, how far dissenters may or may not be justified in their separation from the established church? After the separation of the protestant church of England from that of Rome, there ought never to have been any controversy of that sort. The common justification of us all is, let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind; and that being presupposed, the solidity of any man's reasons for his nonconformity, cannot be estimated by the political rules of any human establishment whatever.

On the other hand, let it not be said, that the clergy of the established church are attached to it by secular motives *only*. There may be a *political dissent*, as well as a *political conformity*. There may be among us, conscientious and liberal minded men, who are dissatisfied with, not to say distressed, by the bonds which their full conformity to the legal establishment lays upon them. Different men may be affected by these, in different degrees; and all who feel the burden, may not only wish, but ought to solicit relief from those who have the power to give it. But it will not follow from their not immediately obtaining such relief, that every clergyman so circumstanced, is obliged to quit his station in the church, and to seek his satisfaction in some other religious community, or his bread in some other employment. In cases of this kind, turn which way you will, there are difficulties too substantial to be got over by every man,

and too important to the man himself, to be submitted to the judgment of others.

But whatever scruples or anxieties a conscientious clergyman may have in the course of his conformity to our present church establishment, he has one comfort, namely, that he is not precluded by any circumstance in his more solemn admission to his office, from making full proof of his ministry, in the most substantial and important parts of it, according to the awful directions he has in the holy scriptures.

Let him look round him, and he will see calls and occasions for his vigilance and his labours, upon which his church puts no restraint, of far more consequence both to himself and the public, than his attention to those inconveniences which must incumber, in part, all religious societies of human institution, perhaps to the end of time.

There is nothing which more evidently proves the divine mission of the apostles, than the exact description they have given us of the last days which were immediately to precede the close and consummation of this worldly system. As we approach nearer to those days, we perceive all those evil habits and dispositions increasing among mankind, which the apostles gave as the marks and tokens of *perilous times*, and which were intended as warnings to those whose province it should be to apply the correctives of the gospel, to reform the principles and manners of that generation of men, among whom their lot should fall.

These warnings we have in the third chapter of St. Paul's epistle to Timothy, when the first heat of persecution was probably over, and

when the freedom of the christians from the terrors of it, had left them no enemies so dangerous and formidable, as their own irregular passions; and they were given to Timothy, a preacher and minister of the christian religion, to awaken his circumspection, to direct him to the best expedients of providing against those evils which were most likely to corrupt the integrity of his flock, and debase the spirit of their religion, by the impure mixture of selfish views and secular interests, utterly inconsistent with that purity of heart and innocence of life, which were the principal distinctions of the christian brotherhood. From Timothy these admonitions have descended to us, as undoubtedly they were intended to do, and it is incumbent upon us to make that use of them, which a careful observation of persons and facts within our respective departments, may enable us to do.

Our business indeed as private pastors, is chiefly with the particular congregations where our lot is fallen; to these we are more especially bound to shew ourselves *patterns of good works*, and, in our doctrine, to shew *uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech which cannot be condemned, that they*, says the apostle, *of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you.**

It is easy to see, that, under these general directions, many specific duties are comprised, which various occasions and incidents may bring into practice. They have respect to

* Tit. ii. 7, 8.

every sort and every means of seduction, to which our respective flocks may be exposed, whether from the profligate corrupters of our public manners, the ignorant zeal of weak enthusiastic teachers, or the more refined sophistry of those subtle and designing emissaries, who would enslave their minds, by bringing them under subjection to an idolatrous and tyrannical superstition.

In a world which is so much given to the study and cultivation of secular wisdom, a religion of so great purity as the christian, would run the hazard of being totally neglected, if the nominal profession of it was not found necessary for certain political purposes, which however it could not be made to answer, if it were only to be professed in its native simplicity: a consideration that has given birth to a thousand formalities in the different establishments of it, all which may be practised without producing the least emotion of that *power of godliness* upon the heart, which was felt by the first converts, upon the preaching of the apostles.

And here it is, that is to say, in our endeavours to revive this influence, that we must expect our sincerity and perseverance will be put to the utmost test. It is an undertaking next to desperate, to attempt to bring back a careless and dissipated people to the pure and uncorrupted fountains of evangelical truth and piety, where so many hypocrites and plausible professors teach them to put so high a value upon mere formalities.

But it is a work indispensably annexed to our calling, and therefore to be undertaken at

all events; and though in the progress of it, we should fall upon expedients that may grate upon the secular and political accommodations, to which some parts of our established system may seem to give countenance, let us remember, that the *wisdom which is from above, is without partiality*, * that it is our especial commission to inforce the *power* of godliness, and that wherever this is our aim, as it is always our duty, it will be of very little consequence to our final account, what becomes of those forms of it, by whatever precedents or examples they are recommended, which derive not their authority from the word of God.

* James iii. 17.

DISCOURSE II.

On the Questions, *What is Christianity?* and *Where is it to be learned?*

IT has been observed, that if you should ask a Jew or a Mahometan concerning their faith respectively, each of them would give you a clear and satisfactory account of his religion, and for the most part, consistent with what another Jew or Mahometan would give, in answer to the question, what is Judaism? or what is Mahometism? Whereas were you to ask the two first christians you meet, one after the other, what is Christianity? you would have two answers as different from each other, as the answer of the Jew or the Mahometan would be from either of them.*

But this is a reflection which most probably was never justified by a fair experiment; and we might safely deny the fact, if the trial should be made in similar circumstances.

Our intercourse with jews or mahometans is not so frequent and familiar, as to let us into the private sentiments of individuals among them, upon the subject of religion. We generally content ourselves with the accounts given of their respective doctrines and institu-

* See Bayle's Article of CHARRON in Dictionary.

tions in their authentic books, the laws of Moses, and the Koran of Mahomet; and these, we suppose, exhibit the uniform standards of their faith and worship. But were we to converse among them in their respective settlements, or where the greatest numbers of them reside; with the jews, for instance, at Amsterdam, or with the Turks at Constantinople, as familiarly as we do with our fellow christians in our own country, we should find them in each department as much divided from each other, as christians of the most different sects are supposed to be. Nor is it possible it should be otherwise, considering the multitude and variety of traditional doctrines and precepts, which have been added to the mosaic code and ritual, and the many different comments of the mahometan doctors on the Koran, according as each was disposed to follow the head of his sect.*

But laying these comparisons out of the case, the question, what is christianity, is a question of importance, particularly to the teachers of it, and a question which they ought frequently to put to themselves. For though the evangelists and apostles, when they are consulted, furnish us with easy, plain, and sufficient answers to every article of christian obligation to which such a question may be supposed to relate, yet by conversing with men and books that fall in our way, our attention may be insensibly drawn off from the great articles of our faith and duty, to con-

* See *Mosheim Instit. Hist. Eccles.* 1764, p. 234, and the authors cited by him. But particularly, the Apology of *Benjamin Ben Mordecai*, letter i. p. 4. 5.

templations upon points, which, though they may be recommended to us as inferences and deductions from the scriptures, have really no more to do with the genuine principles laid down in those sacred records, than the conclusions drawn by the talmudists from detached texts of the pentateuch, have with the unadulterated institutes of Moses.

An intelligent christian might say to a multitude of these reasoners, as the dæmoniac said to the exorcists, *Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?**

One presents you with a complex artificial explanation of particular points of doctrine, expressed in scripture in general terms, frames an ingenious hypothesis, and by the help of a little criticism, and an unreasonable number of postulata, finishes a complete orthodox summary, which you are to take for your rule in matters of doctrine, so far at least as the subject extends.

If you are satisfied with this, it is so far well, you are obliged to the operator, and owe him a compliment for his industry and sagacity. But be not scandalized at those who are not so ready to take his word, and who possibly may tell you, when they have examined the work, "This is not christianity, neither is "christianity to be learned from it."

Another, strongly impressed with a notion of the necessity of what is called church communion, and of the necessity of uniformity to such communion, sets himself to contrive a scheme of church discipline and government,

* Acts xix. 15.

to be inforced by exclusive privileges to the obedient, and a mortifying *præterition*, or perhaps by censures and penalties upon the unfortunate nonconformist: and this being wrought up with all the art and dexterity of an adept in this kind of science, is offered to the public as an expedient to cure all differences and disorders in christian societies.

It would be hard to deny this ingenious artificer his due portion of thanks and praise, and he certainly ought to have it from those who desire to be at ease in the honours and possessions which their mode of professing christianity derives upon them, and for whom it is so convenient, that the curiosity of those who are forward to pry into the political construction of the machine, should be effectually restrained. But whatever advantages of the temporal kind systems of this complexion may intend to produce, it is great odds that they have little countenance from the dictates of christianity, whose genius and spirit are most commonly of a different cast from the principles which give rise to these lucubrations, unless there has been some strange revolution in the christian republic, which hath determined, that what the blessed Jesus reproved in the Scribes and Pharisees with no little asperity, should now be not only most highly esteemed among men, but have the concurrence of heaven into the bargain.

When you inquire, what principle of the christian religion it is which sets these men to work, you are referred to several passages in the apostolical epistles, where the disciples are exhorted, *to be of the same mind one towards*

*another.** *To speak all the same thing*, and *to be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment*, and this, *that there might be no schisms or divisions among them.*† *To be of the same mind in the Lord.*‡ *To be all of one mind,*‖ and the like.

Now allowing these and the like texts to press uniformity in matters of faith and doctrine, I will not ask, what authority they give to these speculatists to obtrude upon others, their own compositions abounding with so large

* Rom. xii. 16. † 1 Cor. i. 10. 2 Cor. xiii. 11. ‡ Phil. iv. 2.

‖ 1 Pet. iii. 8. It may be queſtioned whether the expreſſions, το αὐτο φρονειν, Καταρτιζεσθαι ἐν τω αὐτω νοι, Και ἐν τη αὐτη γνωμη, ομοφρονες ειναι, relate to theological dogmata in theſe paſſages, or to ſome other ſubjects of diviſion among the diſciples. The paſſage, 1 Cor. i. 10, ſeems to give the greateſt countenance to the interpretation which repreſents *doctrines* to have been the ſubject of this ſchiſm. But as it happens, the occaſion of the exhortation is told us by the apoſtle himſelf, and refers to a very different matter, namely, to the Corinthians' valuing themſelves upon the worth or dignity of the miniſter by whom each was converted or inſtructed reſpectively. It would indeed have been ſtrange, if theſe Corinthians ſhould have given offence by their differences in matters of doctrine, to the ſame apoſtle who, v. 4, 5, *gives God thanks for the grace that was given them in Jeſus Chriſt, ſo as to be enriched in him, in all utterance, and in all knowledge, even as the teſtimony of Chriſt was confirmed in them.* Had Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, encouraged theſe diſtinctions among the Corinthians, they could not probably have maintained their reſpective parties otherwiſe than by teaching different doctrines. But this we know was not the caſe; not to mention that the apoſtle would have ſpecified in the courſe of his reprehenſion, the particular doctrine which each of the ſchiſmatics held, if that had been the matter in diſpute; as he does, Rom. xiv. and elſewhere. Mere pride, and the deſire of preference and ſuperiority, ſeems to have been the only occaſion of this contention at Corinth, and no deviation from the ſimplicity of the goſpel doctrine. Bengelius well obſerves that the λεγητε το αυτο παντες, v. 10. refers to ἑκαστος ὑμων λεγει v. 12. and to that only, though the paſſage has been abuſively applied to the uniform profeſſion of the ſame theological propoſitions. But ſee Vitringa Obſ. Sacr. lib. iii. cap. xxi.

mixtures of human inventions, as the proper expedients of unity, upon the christian church; I would only desire to know whenever such artificial forms have been known to produce the perfect concord supposed to be recommended by the apostle, even under the most rigorous establishment? If, on the other hand, they have rather been instrumental in promoting feuds and animosities among christians, as history and experience bear testimony, they are expedients of no value, and should be exchanged for others of a more legitimate original, and of a better tendency.

But whatever the apostles might wish and desire, and exhort, in these and the like passages, we certainly know they did not succeed in their endeavours to bring about a perfect unanimity among the members of the churches which they had planted. There were differences among them in matters of no little importance.* With respect to those opinions and the ritual practices founded upon them, which tended to defeat the purposes of the christian revelation, the apostle Paul was sufficiently peremptory in his opposition, as appears by what he wrote to the Galatians. But his zeal even there, is shewn with the greatest resentment against those who were for encroaching upon the christian liberty of the Galatian converts, by confining them to decisions and forms for which they had no authority in the terms of the gospel.

When in the full enjoyment of the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, some

* See Vitringa Observationes Sacræ, lib. iv. cap. 9.

others differed in points which might be differently understood, and espoused by different persons, consistently with their equally holding the head, Jesus Christ, the same apostle allows of a latitude little consistent with the rigorous expedients of uniformity, which were afterwards contrived, upon a pretence that christianity could not be supported without them.

In these exigencies he preaches up a toleration one among another, that would hardly be admitted in these days, by the most moderate of our modern disciplinarians. He forbids them to judge one another, as having no authority of that kind. He prescribes, that every man should be satisfied and convinced in his own mind, and content himself with the testimony of his own conscience, even in matters of faith, and to leave others who differed from him to their own proper master and judge. He gives them a general rule, not to be wise above what is written;* and writing to the Philippians, iii. 15. he refers those who may think differently from others, whom he calls

* 1 Cor. iv. 6. *Elsner* thinks this passage does not refer to the scriptures in general, but ought to be translated, *ut in nobis discere-tis, non magnificentius de vobis sentire* [φρονειν] *quam scriptum est*: and adds, *nempe in hac Epistola, verbis præcedentibus.* Meaning, I suppose, (for to me this is not perfectly intelligible) the sentiments Paul had expressed concerning himself and Apollos. But *Grotius* well observes, γεγραπται, (scriptum est) in his libris semper ad libros veteris testamenti refertur. And accordingly Bengelius, with great judgment, refers back to chap. iii. 19. 20. where two passages are cited, the one from Job v. 13. the other from Psalm xciv. 11. both implying the deceitfulness and vanity of human wisdom, and to which it is most probable the apostle here alludes; and, consequently, refers them to the *wisdom of God* in the scriptures, for the doctrines they should espouse, without respect to the wisdom or the talents of their

perfect, * to some future revelation, as if the wisdom or the judgment, even of the perfect, might not be sufficient for them to depend upon.

But we are told by some of those who plead for the expedience of particular formularies of doctrine or discipline, "that these tolerating "methods were mere concessions of necessity, "that Paul and his fellow labourers had no "power to act otherwise, as the civil magistrate "might take umbrage at their exercising a sort "of polity, which would appear to interfere "with his absolute authority. But that the "case would be very different when the magi-"strate became christian, took the teachers of "that religion into his protection, and gave "the sanction of his authority to the ecclesi-"astical discipline they recommended to be "established."

The case then indeed did become very different; so different, that he who reads the ecclesiastical histories of those times with a christian spirit, will be tempted to wish, that many of those christian magistrates had followed the example of a heathen magistrate, of whose conduct on occasion of a religious dispute, we have an account in our own scripture.

The character given of Gallio, passes with many in the present times, for that of a man

teachers. Some have conjectured, that *Apollos*, who was *an eloquent man, and mighty*, (well versed) *in the scriptures, but imperfectly instructed in the way of God*, might, notwithstanding the pains taken with him by *Aquila*, at *Ephesus*, carry with him into *Achaia* some peculiarities in his *way* of teaching, not altogether agreeable to the simplicity of the gospel. Acts xviii. 24—27.

* *Perfectos*, hic vocat, in rebus divinis optime versatos. *Grot.*

totally void of all religious impressions, for that, in short, of a profane infidel, who neither feared God nor regarded man: a prejudice which arises from the expression, that *he cared for none of those things.*

It may indeed be questioned, whether this observation of the evangelist relates to Gallio's refusal to hear the accusation against Paul, or to the subsequent treatment of Sosthenes: nor is it very material to what part of the transaction this indifference may be applied. It is sufficient that we are not left without Gallio's reason why he declined to take cognizance of the matter in dispute between Paul and his accusers.

The charge was, that Paul persuaded men to worship God, contrary to the jewish law; to which, without entering either into the matter of fact or the matter of right, this wise and worthy magistrate thus answers.

If it were a matter of wrong, or wicked lewdness, O ye jews, reason would that I should bear with you. But if it be a question of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it, for I will be no judge of such matters.

It had been happy for Gallio, had he listened to St. Paul upon the subject of this accusation. One may presume, from the character transmitted to us of his good sense, his sweet disposition, and inflexible probity,* that his conversion to christianity must have been the consequence, and the man himself an honour and an ornament to the profession.

* See the proofs exhibited in Wetstein's greek testament, of Gallio's personal virtues, on *Acts* xviii. 12, vol. ii. p. 575.

But his conduct in disclaiming in the person of a civil magistrate, the province of a judge in a dispute on a religious subject, which implied no private injury to any individual, no criminal offence in the moral demeanour of the accused party, nor any disturbance of the public peace, was not the less agreeable to reason or the dictates of christianity, than if he had been a christian himself.

Gallio, say some divines, was a heathen, and little concerned about the fate of the jewish religion, which was then upon the eve of its dissolution. The providence of God therefore so ordered it, that this man's indifference on this occasion, should remove the obstruction which the complaint of the jews might otherwise have given to the apostle's ministry, in propagating the christian dispensation.

But, say the same men, when the support and protection of the true christian religion is required against heretics, schismatics, or infidels, the christian magistrate would not do his duty, if he did not interpose his authority to punish, or at least discountenance those who hold and preach false doctrines.

All this might be admitted, if the christian magistrate, in virtue of his office, could discern more than another man, what doctrines are true, and what are false, and more particularly when both parties appeal to the same standard, the holy scriptures.

The civil magistrate may indeed know as much of the matter as any other fallible man; and if he chuses to interpose in such cases, it may be just as well for himself, and generally speaking much better for the people, that he

should do it according to his own plain, natural sentiments, than that he should be guided by the artificial refinements of others who may claim a right of devising a religious system for him.

But the truth is, neither the one nor the other are authorised to frame a proper directory for the man who is disposed seriously and diligently to examine and judge for himself; as in the event, he is not to stand or fall by man's judgment, but by his own sincerity and integrity in the sight of God. If such a one after his utmost endeavours does not find out the real truth, he finds out what will answer the end of truth to himself. He finds out what appears to him to be the will of God, and the mind of Christ, and by steadily pursuing this in his practice, he is upon a level, as to the authority of his creed, with the most respectable of his superiors in station, who indeed have just the same right that he has of judging for themselves, and of abounding in their own sense, but neither more nor less than he hath to prescribe his own sense of disputable points, as a rule and standard for all his fellow christians.

When facts and events speak so plainly and audibly in justification of these positions, it is to little purpose to appeal to laboured deductions from principles *a priori*, i. e. to considerations of *necessity*, *order*, *expedience*, and the like. Take any particular system now extant, wrought up with the greatest appearance of wisdom and learning, and established upon the most equitable conditions, and if you confine your instructions to that only, the progress of

the learner in the knowledge of christianity, will be very small. The reason is, the doctrine is above his capacity; he will not understand it. Send him to the scriptures for a confirmation of your system, and it is highly probable he will see things in a very different light. He may indeed learn in those sacred oracles what christianity is, but he may possibly learn at the same time, that your artificial theory is not christianity.

Establishments of religion, for public worship, and other good purposes of mutual edification, are doubtless highly expedient, and in the present state of things, even necessary. But when the edification of a christian people is the object of them, great care should be taken that they go not beyond the bounds prescribed by the nature of the dispensation on which they profess to be founded, which in this case, the scriptures exhibit with sufficient perspicuity and precision. Whenever men have acted in such cases without their proper warrant, error, mischief, and tyranny have been the certain consequences, of which popery stands as a deplorable instance, and an awful warning to all future times. So far as establishments of religion are either necessary or expedient, they are necessary and expedient for every serious and sincere christian. Can then those establishments be good, can they be righteous, can they be christian establishments, which exclude from christian privileges numbers of pious and serious christians, by prescribing conditions of communion, which

neither Christ nor his apostles have authorised, or so much as mentioned?

Submission to governors is a necessary and a christian duty, and while we are exposed in this transitory scene of things, to the fraud, injustice, and oppression of unreasonable and wicked men, the protection we expect from them, demands our compliance with their ordinances, even in things which might otherwise seem to bear hard upon the ease and interest of some individuals. Perhaps this obligation may to a certain degree be understood to extend to religious ordinances under the sanction of public authority. It may be expedient, for example, that the teachers of religion should comply with some things which *edify not*, that they may be useful in matters of more importance. But such compliance in christian states, should have its limits. The plain word of God, where christianity is publicly professed, is always to take place of the ordinances of man; and where there is an indisputable contrariety, to comply with the latter, cannot be innocent: and even in doubtful cases, where offences or scruples may arise in the minds of conscientious men, neither blameable in their moral character, nor obnoxious to civil government in other respects, to be rigorous and severe in exacting conformity, is more than the authority of the christian magistrate can justify. And in such cases, to desire and to solicit a revision of established forms and institutions, cannot be reasonably interpreted into an offence, or even an affront to the civil powers. There certainly can be no crime in desiring a reformation of such par-

ticulars in the public system of religion, as cannot be supported by the sure testimony of the word of God. A christian minister may think it his duty to remonstrate upon such subjects with freedom and courage; and who will say, it is not his duty? And where it is a duty, I am sure it cannot be a crime to point out blemishes and defects that have a manifest tendency to obstruct the edification of a christian people, which ought to be the principal thing considered in framing every religious establishment, of which christianity is the basis.

A late ingenious writer, sensible, no doubt, whither this reflection would carry those teachers, who are disposed, seriously and impartially, to compare religious ordinances, under the authority of a civil establishment, with the terms of christian communion exhibited in the scriptures, has observed, that "it was not ne-" cessary that christianity should always con-" tinue in the same circumstances, in which " our Saviour himself and his apostles left it."*

* Essay on Establishments, &c. What a pity the papists were not apprised of this *no necessity* at the time of reformation? "Luther and Calvin insisted," says Mr. Bayle, "that the christianity of " the sixteenth century, was not at all like the christianity of the " three first centuries. The romish clergy maintained the contrary." *Nouvelles Lettres d'Auteur de la critique general sur la Hist. de Calvinisme*, p. 430. And consequently, that reformation was not necessary. Luther and Calvin, upon the supposition that christianity had undergone a deplorable change for the worse, were for bringing it back to its primitive circumstances. The papists asserted the circumstances of christianity had undergone no change; Mr. Bayle shews how easily they were confuted by matters of fact; and Luther and Calvin, in this part of the dispute, conquered and triumphed accordingly. Had the papists luckily thought of this *no*

If this writer had only meant, that it was not necessary that christianity should remain in the same circumstances of persecution, in which our Saviour left it, and which the apostles and their successors experienced at different periods, for the first three hundred years after the appearance of Christ, the proposition might be admitted, as a state of peace and security did not imply any necessity of deviating from the purity and simplicity of its rites and doctrines, as prescribed in the christian scriptures.

But when the same writer proceeds to say, that "if christianity, when it put down false "and corrupt establishments, and thereby de-"prived government of its ancient ally, had "refused itself to associate with the civil pow-"er, it would have done the most essential "injury to society," we can consider him no otherwise, than as an apologist for all those corruptions in doctrine and worship, which have been introduced into the christian church for political purposes, from the time it was first taken into the protection of the civil magistrate.

A reader of the scriptures, even with an ordinary portion of common sense, will see at once, that the disinterested purity and simplicity of the gospel of Christ, will not admit of its being made the tool of political greatness and power in the smallest degree; as nothing

neceſſity, they might eaſily have defended the moſt abſurd of their doctrines, and the moſt idolatrous parts of their worſhip, on the pretence, that they were neceſſarily ſubſervient to the greatneſs and power of government; and that ſhould chriſtianity diſown them, chriſtianity muſt be injurious to ſociety.

is more evident, than that such greatness and power are generally promoted by principles and dispositions, the most repugnant to those which are injoined by the precepts and doctrines of Christ and his apostles.

Nor is christianity at all injurious to society on this account. When christianity speaks of civil society, and of the ends which its rulers should aim at in their respective provinces, the political greatness and power of government are not its concern. It proposes a much better and nobler end, namely, *that men may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty:* an end sufficient for the earthly happiness of every christian society; an end which is seldom if ever accomplished, where greatness and power are the principal objects of government; which (if we may be permitted to judge from experience and examples) are commonly pursued by such arts and violations of the equitable rights of society, as are at utter enmity with godliness, honesty, quietness, and peace.

Another ingenious person, a fellow labourer in the same popular cause, finding, it is likely, some circumstances in modern ecclesiastical governments not quite so conformable to the scriptures, as for the honour and credit of the protestant religion, and for the sake of consistency of profession, one would wish they might be, apologises for this state of things by a suggestion, which turns not so immediately upon the supposition of a change of circumstances in christianity, as upon that of a want of precision in the sacred writings.

This writer having observed, that "there "are doubts and questions concerning church-"authority, which the bare words of scrip-"ture will never enable us to resolve," proceeds to say, "It is in this instance as in many "others. Men consult scripture for what is "not to be found in it; an accurate descrip-"tion of their rights and duties: whereas the "knowledge of these," (and among the rest, the knowledge of the rights and duties comprehended in the nature and foundation of church-authority) "is *supposed.* not *taught,* by "the sacred writers."*

* Dr. Balguy's sermon at the consecration of the bishop of Llandaff, p. 4.—This expedient of fathering things upon the scripture by way of *suppoſition*, is of no little use to certain writers, who do not chuſe to unmask all at once. We have been told, that the *immortality of the ſoul*, in a ſtate of *ſeparation* from the body, nay that even the *unity* and *exiſtence* of the Deity are taken for granted in the ſcriptures, taken for granted as truths demonſtrable by natural light. Shall we conclude, as Dr. Balguy does with reſpect to church authority, that men conſult the ſcriptures on the ſubject of the *unity* and *exiſtence* of the Deity, for what is not to be found in them? If not, to what purpoſe the obſervation? An honeſt plain ſearcher of the ſcriptures may perhaps be ſtartled at the aſſertion, and not a little ſurpriſed at the aſſurance of the man who ventures to publiſh it, not being appriſed of the turn that is to be ſerved by an inſinuation of that ſort. If you can be perſuaded that the *unity* and *exiſtence* of the Deity, are rather *ſuppoſed* and *taken for granted*, than expreſsly taught in the ſcriptures, your faith will not be put to the ſtretch by believing that the ſame may be the caſe with the immortality of the ſeparate ſoul, or with Dr. Balguy's ſyſtem of church authority. It is indeed true enough, that neither of theſe are to be found in the ſcriptures, not becauſe the ſcripture *ſuppoſes* them or *takes them for granted*, but becauſe they are the mere figments of human conceit, manifeſtly ſubverſive, in the one caſe, of the chriſtian doctrine of redemption, and in the other, of all chriſtian liberty. That writers and preachers, who want to continue an undue influence over the conſciences of their fellow chriſtians, ſhould take theſe free-

In another passage, however, of the same discourse, we are informed, that "the founders of our holy religion established a form of church government;" but lest we should conclude too hastily, that the nature and foundation of church authority might be learned from that establishment, the preacher immediately adds, "but their directions to us are for the most part very general. Even their example must be cautiously urged, in different times and under different circumstances. In this one point they are clear and explicit, that *authority* once established must be *obeyed*." p. 18.

Without pointing out the incongruity of these two passages, one with the other, and particularly the little occasion for general directions,

doms with the scriptures, is not marvellous. But I must confess it gave me some concern to find an ingenious and able adversary to the doctrine of this sermon, arguing, upon another occasion, from *Matth.* xviii. 15—17, that "our Lord *took it for granted*, that his disciples would form themselves into such societies, and that those powers of admonition, censure, and excommunication would be assumed and exercised. We may therefore conclude," (says this worthy person a little incautiously) "*with certainty*, that the great lawgiver and judge of christians really meant that such churches, with such provisions and powers, should be erected; and we ought to consider this as a sufficient authority, and even as equivalent to an express injunction to form them." *Dr. Priestley's Essay on church discipline*, p. 120, 121. I am afraid the worthy Doctor would find it difficult to shew, that this *presumptive injunction being presupposed*, Dr. Balguy's or even Pope Clement's societies are not as much intituled to this *assumption* and *exercise* of the provisions and powers he mentions, as such societies as he had in his eye. Having made so liberal a concession in general terms, he would, I am afraid, find it in vain to confine Dr. Balguy to the example of the first planters of christianity.—See *Locke's 2d vindication of his reasonableness of christianity*, p. 255. ed. 8vo. 1697.

where the accurate knowledge of particulars is *supposed*, I would only observe, that according to this doctrine, when we tell the papists, that we cannot find the plenitude of the pope's ecclesiastical power in the scriptures, they may answer, that this power is rather *supposed*, than expressly taught in the scriptures: and what should we have to reply? For one sort, or one mode of ecclesiastical government may just as well be *supposed* in the scriptures as another; and "the founders of our holy religion being "*clear* and *explicit*, that authority once esta- "blished *must* be *obeyed*," in what light must our first reformers appear, who opposed themselves to an authority which had a possession of several centuries to plead against their claims and pretensions?*

And then again, why may not other things be *supposed*, without being taught in the scripture, as well as the nature and foundation of church-authority? Why not articles of faith, and objects of religious worship? And where shall we draw the line which distinguishes what is clearly and explicitly required, from what is only supposed and taken for granted?

* It is but fair to apprise the reader that this argument no longer affects Dr. Balguy's system of church authority delivered in this sermon. In his charge to the clergy of the archdeaconry of Winchester in the year 1772, he professes himself the defender, not only of popery, but of every establishment under heaven. How consistent this character of a catholic champion may be, with that of a defender of the protestant church of England as by law established, may perhaps appear from some considerations offered to the public in the fourth of these discourses. In the mean time, our reformers must lie under the reproach of having *disobeyed authority once established*.

What kind of representations of christianity are these? What could tempt men of sense and learning to defend establishments upon these licentious principles, at the expence of almost every evangelical duty, and every benevolent end, injoined and proposed by our Lord and his apostles in this gracious and heavenly dispensation, for the instruction and reformation of a degenerate race of mortals, lying in darkness and the shadow of death, without hope, and even without God in the world?

The only inference I would draw from these particulars is, the necessity we are under to consider for ourselves, what is christianity? To be going back frequently to this question, when we meet with men or books, which either through a false zeal, or a worse motive, are attempting to lead us into plausible systems and theories, adapted, not to the discovery of the truth, or the conviction of falsehood, but merely contrived to support and continue things in their present state whatever it may be, and to discourage all examination into the grounds and principles on which they are established.

We boast in vain of our improvements, under the lights afforded us from the time of Luther's reformation to the present period, if we must still be confined to interpret scripture according to scholastic definitions, and traditional conjectures, adopted in times when no better information could be had, and afterwards supported for the purpose of advancing the power and authority of ambitious ecclesiastics, from whose tyranny our forefathers found it

necessary to withdraw themselves on the peril of being deprived of the benefits of the gospel, and of every advantage which the study of the scriptures hath since derived upon the professors of the protestant religion.

What the church of Rome would substitute in the place of these sacred oracles, under the name of antiquity, is little better than a heap of fictions, improved from traditional memorials of men, who were far from deserving the credit they have met with.* Nor is it any wonder that so many of these primitive memorialists should be so little scrupulous either in misreporting matters of fact, adulterating the simplicity of gospel doctrines, or adopting superstitious rites of worship, after the apostles were dead, when we consider that they were only the successors of a set of men who had acted the same part in their life-time, as appears from several passages in the apostolic history and epistles. St. Paul, in particular, reprehends a number of idle and superstitious notions and practices, and, as the learned Scaliger hath shewn, alludes to many more, attempted to be introduced into the churches

* See the Lord Clarendon's excellent tract, *of the reverence due to antiquity*. Collection of tracts fol. 218. And then compare the grounds on which he enforced uniformity while he was in power, with these his convictions, which can hardly be considered as merely the effects of his meditations at Montpelier; and having compared his practice with these sentiments concerning the precedents on which it was founded, forbear if you can to exclaim, *how hardly shall an ecclesiastical politician enter into a kingdom which is not of this world!*

he himself hath planted, and as it were under his very eye.*

To these presumptuous corrupters he gives many severe reproofs, and to their attempts it is that he opposes that necessary caution, *Coloss.* ii. 8. *Beware lest any man spoil you* [*or make a prey of you*] *through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after* CHRIST. A caution perhaps not more necessary for the times in which it was delivered, than for our own.

And this being the case while the apostles still survived, what can we think of the times and the men which succeeded them? Were these likely to furnish more authentic precedents against the sense of the apostle himself? Does he not point them out as *grievous wolves* that, *after his departure, should enter in, not sparing the flock?* Foretelling to the Ephesian elders, that *even from among themselves, men should arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.*† That is to say, to

* Non frustra Apostolus, 2 *Thess.* ii. 7. ait, ἤδη μυστηριον ἀνομιας ἐνεργεῖσθαι. Tunc enim exitiabiles ritus et errores incipiebant primulum, quorum partem verbis castigavit, quia nocebant exemplo trahenti perniciem veniens in ævum, partem quia tollere non poterat, in super habuit. SCALIGER in 1 *Cor.* xv. 29

† *Acts* xx. 29, 30. and compare Apoc. ii. 1—6, Commentators generally apply this character of *men speaking perverse things*, &c. to the *heretics* of those times, and, by *accommodation*, to those moderns who differ from their particular system, and who become of course the progeny of those corrupters, of whom the apostle here meant to warn the Ephesian elders. Erasmus, however, gives the word διεστραμμενα the signification of *distorta* or *obliqua*. *Hoc est*, says he, *minime simplicia, minime syncera. Nam veritatis, ut ait tragicus, simplex est oratio.* According to which exposition, even some reputedly orthodox creedmakers may not be out of the reach of this prophecy.

procure and establish a strong party of men of their own stamp, to abet their ambitious and worldly designs at all events. In which, as we learn from history, they succeeded but too well, not without deriving the impressions they made in those early ages, upon the present times; nor would it perhaps be too rash a conjecture, that many of those whom we are inclined to venerate as the primitive leaders of our ecclesiastical fashions, might be the very pragmatical teachers whom the apostle meant here to mark as the men to be most avoided.

Finally, it is not only material for our own information to learn what true christianity is, or where it may be found, but material for the information of those who are committed to our care and oversight, as ministers of the gospel. The common people are subject to delusions in matters of religion of various kinds, but more particularly to those which arise from the prejudices they contract in favour of the system in which they have been educated, and by which their principles are instilled as it were mechanically, without sufficient pains taken with them by their instructors, to shew them how what they profess, is connected with or related to the true foundation of their christain faith and worship.

Our province requires us not only to lead our people into the way of truth, but, as much as possible, to inspire them with the love of it, to shew them the comfort and advantages of christian knowledge, to prevail with them to search and examine the scriptures for themselves, and to bring every thing that is taught

them to that test; so that they may not only be ready to give a proper answer to those who ask a reason of the hope that is in them, but may likewise have a sufficient stock of this sacred treasure to apply on all occasions, for consolation in adversity, for support under every trial, and for stedfastness and resolution in the course of their christian practice, wherein they will meet with so many temptations, so many bad examples to turn them out of the way of truth, so much opposition, scorn, and contempt to discourage their perseverance, and so much plausible sophistry to allure them into the ambitious, avaricious, and sensual pursuits of worldly good; and all from those who profess the same religion with themselves, but would pretend to improve it by maxims of prudence and decency, which, in the event, make a conformity to the world a more indispensable qualification of a christian, than that renewal of the mind which is opposed to it by the apostle Paul, as the means of proving or discerning more perfectly the will of God, in the dispensation of the gospel.

Nothing, in our present situation, can be more unworthy of our ministerial calling, than to take the advantage of any personal esteem we may have from our people, or of any wrong notions they may entertain of peculiar gifts and privileges belonging to the clerical character, to inculcate our own private opinions and sentiments on disputable points of doctrine, as matters of faith to be believed on the peril of their salvation. We may, and we ought

freely to profess our sentiments, and, with a becoming modesty, give our reasons why we adopt them; but to say to the multitude, thus and thus ye must believe, or be shut out of the kingdom of heaven, may amaze and terrify the ignorant and the fearful, and procure an outward assent to what is advanced with such assurance; and in certain circumstances, may serve perhaps to gain over numbers to strengthen a sect or a party, but will not add one grain of christian knowledge or christian edification to the reasonable mind of the humble hearer, who, whatever may be pretended, is as much intituled to the knowledge of the truth, as the ablest of his teachers.

True christianity speaks another language. *Search the scriptures whether these things are so.—Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God. Beware of false prophets. Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right. I speak,* says the great apostle of the gentiles, *as to wise men, judge ye what I say.*

Be these our rules in our teaching, and be these our instructions to our hearers. Let us be cloathed with the same moderation and with the same humility, and, as far as possible, prevail with our people to make themselves judges from their own diligent study of the scriptures, what true christianity is. And let us be assured that the more we succeed in these exhortations and endeavours, the more sincere believers, and the more true servants of God we shall find among them; and what is still more, we shall find more agreement in opinions, more union

of affections, and more edification every way, among ourselves, than ever yet was produced, or ever will be, either by the terrors or allurements invented by the wisdom of the world to inforce uniformity of faith and worship, or by the peremptory decisions and sentences of particular teachers, pretending with unabashed assurance, to supernatural illuminations. The glory cannot be great in either case, when the numbers that are added either to an established system, or to a sect or party deviating from it, are merely the proselytes of ignorance and credulity.

DISCOURSE III.

On the true meaning of the phrase,

THE INTERESTS OF RELIGION.

IT is a complaint of long standing, and has been often occasionally repeated, that most of the controversies on theological subjects, which have disturbed the peace of christian churches of different denominations, have been owing to the abuse and misapplication of certain terms, invented by those who took upon them to fix the standard of orthodoxy for the religious societies in which they respectively presided.

They who were unwilling to be concluded by such arbitrary interpretations of scripture, esteeming them only as the unauthorised tenets of some particular doctor, who had credit and influence enough with his party to procure their reception and establishment; set themselves to examine, by such lights as those times in which they lived afforded, into the foundation on which these systems were built. The consequences were, opposition and controversy, which arising in times when good learning and rational criticism were at a low ebb, the contest generally speaking, became in the end a mere strife of words, concerning which both

sides were often equally mistaken, and equally distant from the true sense of the sacred writings to which they respectively appealed.

The instances of this kind were so many from those times when they who are called the fathers of the church, met in synods and councils, and thence through the squabbling times of the schoolmen, down to the period when the protestant reformation gave rise to new questions, that the learned Scaliger, who was eminently qualified to pass a competent judgment on the case, was provoked to say, that "all "the controversies in religion were occasioned "by an ignorance of grammar,"* a reflection which, though it might not be universally true, was certainly true with very few exceptions.

When, upon occasion of settling the forms of faith and worship, the question was, what system should be established as the creed or confession of a public society, it was usually determined by a plurality of voices, not often indeed of a learned, pious, and dispassionate assembly, but more frequently by the prevailing clamour of a disorderly multitude, impressed with the notions of a favourite leader; at least if the ecclesiastical writers have made faithful reports of the times and the men of which they have given the history.†

Some of these determinations make a part even of some protestant establishments to this

* Non aliunde diffidia in religione pendent, quam ab ignoratione grammaticæ. SCALIGERANA PRIMA. Voce, *grammatica.*

† See Jortin's Remarks on Ecclesiastical history, vol. iii. 1754, from p. 54 to p. 82.

day, and as such are espoused and adhered to as the venerable doctrines of primitive antiquity; and when objections have been made to them, as being founded on mistaken senses of scripture, the defendants have always pleaded, that they who lived nearest the times of the sacred writers were most likely to know their meaning. And though this was manifestly begging the question, as the dispute was concerning words whose signification might be determined by the works of authors nearly contemporary with the writers of the New Testament,* yet this was and still is an entrenchment out of which even learned men have not ventured, from a general consciousness, and perhaps not without a particular experience, that the adversary could not safely be encountered upon more open ground.

If it should still be thought that this prejudice would be insufficient to keep matters in this train among an inlightened and improving people, as we pretend to be, there is I am afraid but one other way of accounting for it, not peculiar to this or that religious society, but common to all of them which are established by sanctions of law. In every such society there will be a sort of politicians, who observing how greatly a persuasion of the perfection of the ruling system contributes to supply and secure the temporal emoluments annexed to the profession of it, will be apt to encourage an implicit attachment to the adopted forms, and to dis-

* The labours of Lightfoot, Gataker, Grotius, Heinsius, Capellus, Vitringa, Raphelius, Elsner, Wetstein, and hardly fewer than a hundred more, have contributed to illustrate the christian scriptures to a degree of which our first reformers could have no conception.

countenance all freedom of inquiry, not only by flourishes of rhetoric, and specious argument, but too often by the interposition of supercilious authority.

On another hand, tenderness for weak brethren, prepossessed by invincible prejudices of education, the disagreeable circumstances attending altercation with obstinate and perverse zealots, and the little that is to be got by contending, where the favour or the frowns of the great can so easily supersede the strongest arguments founded upon reason, and even the word of God; are considerations that may dispose many an honest and sensible man to keep his sentiments to himself, and to acquiesce under many inconveniences in his present situation, and wait with patience for that desirable season, when the mist of prejudice shall be dispelled, and way made for the free course of truth and righteousness by the removal of overbearing authority, and the corrupt influence of secular policy.

In the mean time, the liberal mind of man cannot always be controlled, or over-ruled, by any confederacies of the powers of this world. To such minds, I trust, I am now speaking; and, where the education and profession of a protestant clergy, leads them to the examination of every thing that concerns the religion they are called to *teach*, as well as to *profess*, there could not be a greater indignity offered, either to their integrity or their understandings, than to suppose, that they take any system of doctrine and worship upon trust, and merely because it has the sanction of pub-

lic authority; or that they should sacrifice their own sentiments to any considerations foreign to the character and office of a christian teacher.

Presuming upon this characteristic of my audience, I shall now take the liberty to lay before you one of those cases where the misapplication of a common expression, with a plausible sound, has passed with numbers of all parties in turn, for a criterion of the truth and excellence of their particular profession, upon the merit of being the alledged end of their respective leaders, in settling the terms of conformity to the particular forms of doctrine and discipline they have espoused.

The expression I mean, is, THE INTERESTS OF RELIGION. If a man can be persuaded, that to profess his faith in such or such a form, or to worship God with such or such circumstances, is for *the interests of religion*, preferably to other modes or circumstances, he will conclude of course, that all deviations from his prescribed creed or ritual, are against *the interests of religion*, and will be accordingly tenacious in professing them, and zealous in maintaining them, without the least idea in what *the true interests of religion* consist, or by what means they might be most effectually promoted.

The grounds of this mistaken zeal are not difficult to be assigned.

The most zealous apologists for religious establishments, whether founded upon civil or ecclesiastical authority, have been obliged to acknowledge, that the very best and wisest of them have fallen far short of the effects pro-

posed by them, and expected from them at their first institution. These effects, to take them at the lowest, are declared to be, that the people to be edified by them, being made wise unto salvation by proper instruction, should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.

That all human establishments of religion in all countries, have come short of these gracious purposes, it would indeed be in vain to deny. The gross ignorance of the common people, the profligacy of public manners, the impiety of great numbers, the injustice, contentiousness, falsehood, and dishonesty of still more, are matters of general notoriety in all countries; where, nevertheless, the very worst of men profess a zealous attachment to the religious system established by the ruling powers, and are very often the most bigotted in the defence of it.

If, in considering the rise and progress of these evils in the community, and how far they might be remedied by the influence of religion, you should suggest, that the plan might be altered, and expedients introduced which would tend more both to the edification of the people, and reformation of their manners; you would immediately be told, that "the fault is not in "the forms and circumstances of the establish-"ment, but in the people themselves, who "neglect to apply to their religious occasions, "the means provided by the establishment for "their spiritual benefit;" and this being presupposed, "it follows," we are told, "that "worse mischiefs are to be apprehended from "attempting to reform the establishment, and

" thereby unsettling the minds of the sober " and pious conformists, who are edified by it " to the utmost of their wants and wishes, than " can arise from leaving things in their pre- " sent train, where the civil powers may so " easily interpose to correct the scandals and " offences occasioned by the irreligious con- " formist; and the conclusion is, that it is " more for *the interests of religion,* that the " established ordinances should remain as they " are."

Let us then examine, apart from the consideration of the force of this particular argument, and without inquiring what may be objected to, or alledged in defence of particular establishments; in what *the interests of religion* truly consist, and what is the genuine signification of that expression.

The word, *interest,* in the common acceptation of it, is a term relative to some kind of competition for benefits or advantages to be gained to some particular person, or some particular cause, superior to the benefits or advantages which would accrue from a different principle, or mode of action; and the idea it first suggests, is that of some *temporal* advantage.

It is, for example, for the *interest* of an individual, whose view is to make a fortune in the world, that he should be placed in a situation where his rivals have the least power, where there are the fewest obstructions to his projects, the greatest number of his friends and favourers, and the most commodious means of exercising the particular art or science, or industry, on which his success depends.

If we carry this idea from an individual, to bodies and societies of men in combination, we find it is for the interest of their common cause, that its partizans be numerous and powerful, able to controul their rivals and opponents, and that the cause itself be such, as, in case of success, will derive upon its friends and abettors the several emoluments and advantages, which are proposed by those who enter into such engagements.

The word, *religion*, on the other hand, when it is applied to that sort of it which we ourselves profess, ought never to mean any religion but the christian religion, as it is held forth in the scriptures. To apply the word religion to the system of any particular church or sect, professing christianity exclusively, is to abuse the term, by appropriating it to that church or sect in a sense which implies, that other churches or sects have no religion. Whereas every sect or party has an equal right so to apply it, and the consequence would be, that what in one church or sect is for the interest or advancement of religion, would be absolutely the destruction of it in another.

The reason is plain. Churches, sects, and societies, formed upon plans of doctrine and worship peculiar to each respectively, have, in their several policies or institutions, certain interests so called, to cultivate, with which the christian religion, as such, hath nothing to do. The christian religion does not consider or provide for the interests of mankind as they are members of this or that sect or party, but as they are heirs, every one in his own right, and upon his own title, to the kingdom of heaven;

nor will a plurality of professors of one system of doctrine and worship, compared with another, and established with all the sanctions and formalities which human authority can give it, alter the case in the least degree. For it is possible, many a man may be a good christian upon the principles of the gospel of Christ, and yet fall far short of the conditions of membership prescribed by any one particular sect or church of nominal christians upon earth.

It is impossible to speak of *the interests of religion* among christians, with any sort of propriety, when the word *interest* is taken for any temporal advantage, (which, however, must always be the case when the *interest* of a particular church or sect is meant.) The spirit and genius of christianity hath no tendency, nor affords any means or motives to cultivate any such interests.

If you speak of the *interests of religion* in any other sense of the words, that is to say, for the *interest* every man has in his future inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, the words are once more perverted from the truth, and from their natural sense. For this manner of speaking supposes a rivalship, where the successful candidate excludes his competitor from all benefit or advantage of the prize in contest.

Undoubtedly it is for the glory of God, that the gospel should spread far and wide, from one end of the earth to the other. But this, we find, ends in the numbers of individuals in every country, sect, and party, who *fear God and work righteousness*, without any regard to the peculiar modes of worship, or systems of

doctrine of human device, which the denominations of religionists to whom such individuals join themselves respectively, may prescribe or practise. All the *religious interest* that can here be considered, is the *personal interest* that every man has in the *fruits* of his religion, or in the recompense of his piety and righteousness; which if you should call *the interests of religion*, or, as the state of the case requires, *the interests of the gospel*, you absurdly substitute the *means* for the *end*, and become absolutely unintelligible.

I am very sensible, that men began very early to talk of the honour and credit that accrued to the christian religion, on the rapid progress it made, and the numbers that were converted to it, and hence might easily enough adopt the notion, that this honour and credit terminated, some way or other, in the *interests* of the christian religion. It is possible too, that some countenance might be given to this notion, by some expressions in the scriptures of the new testament.

St. PAUL, for example, talks of *becoming the servant of all, that he might gain the more*, and mentions his conforming in several respects to the Jews *under the law*, and to the gentiles *without the law*, that he might *gain* some of both.*

The question is, to what these several converts were *gained?* As the apostle conformed himself to so many different sorts of professors, the inference has been, that he complied with the singularities of these various characters, in

* 1 Cor. ix. 19, 20, 21.

order to gain the greater numbers to, and consequently to promote the *interests* of the christian faith.

Here then arises another question. How was, or how could the christian faith be *interested* in these *gains?* The christian faith was what it was, whether many or few were gained to it. Neither could it receive any intrinsic strength or advantage from the number of converts to it, nor be impaired or diminished, either as to its truth or its importance, though its professors had been ever so few. And therefore the apostle, meaning most probably to obviate this wrong apprehension, varies his expression in other passages, and at verse 22. says, *I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.**

Here, we see, these *gains* end in the *salvation* of the persons so *gained;* in the salvation of individuals, not as members of a sect, but as members of the undivided body of Christ. He speaks indeed in the context of a *reward* † accruing to himself from preaching the gospel, but this we find ends in his being partaker of the gospel, that is, of the benefits of the gospel with them that he had so gained.‡

The idea of *interest*, as it stands, for any temporal advantage, is indeed utterly inconsistent with any description of religion we have in the scriptures. St. *James* says, *pure religion and undefiled before God and the father, is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.*‖

* 1 Cor. ix. 22.
† 1 Cor. ix. 17, 18. ‡ v. 23. ‖ James i. 27.

What are the *gains* or the *interest* of this sort of *religion?* Nothing, but the final acceptance of the religionist with God hereafter. For these are all personal duties, from which, so far as the practiser's religion is concerned, no *interest* arises but to himself, and that an interest only in future.

The Greek word which is here translated *religion*, properly signifies *worship*, and sometimes indeed the public worship of a particular sect; as where the apostle Paul speaks of the Jew's religion. *Acts* xxvi. 5. But St. James takes his description of religion out of all relation to particular forms of public worship, and places it in a practice, to which persons of all sects and churches may conform, without any help from, or reference to the ritual institutions, by which his society is distinguished from the rest. And in this, St. Paul perfectly agrees with him, where he says, *he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God.**

The considerations which are suggested by this view of our subject are too many and various, to be taken within the compass of a discourse adapted to such occasions as the present. I shall therefore only add a few remarks upon a single text of scripture, which sets forth the means as well as the end of professing the christian religion, and may perhaps assist us to conceive wherein the true *interests*

* Rom. ii. 28, 29.

of it consist, so far as that term may be applied to it with any propriety.

St. Paul, in his first epistle to *Timothy, chap.* ii. 4. tells him, that *God willeth that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth;* where out of all doubt, the *coming to the knowledge of the truth*, is spoken of as the means of being saved, and consequently the primary object of the will of God.* By the *truth* is here meant the doctrine of the gospel, or the word of God, and the consequence is, that the more of this knowledge any man acquires, the better he is qualified to work out his salvation.

It is the will of God then, that this *truth* should be known to all men, to men of every class, and in every station. And in order to its being known to the extent that the will of God intends it should be, the apostle in another epistle exhorts the Thessalonians to pray, for the preachers of the word of God, that it might have its free course, unmolested and unrestrained by the opposition which unreasonable and wicked men were disposed to give to such preachers.† And in the same place he mentions another advantage the word of God would gain by this *freedom*, the advantage of being *glorified*, as well as *known* by this extensive dispersion of it.

If then we should chuse to call this *glorification* of the word of God, arising from the

* *Et ut ferventur, vult eos venire ad cognitionem veritatis.* Evangelicæ, Scilicet. *Grotius.* Who adds, hoc cum ita sit, debemus et dare operam, ut omnibus innoteſcat veritas, et ei labori, preces pro omnibus adjungere.

† 2 Theſſ. iii. 1, 2.

extensive progress it makes among mankind, the *interest of religion*, though the term may be improperly applied, it may serve to instruct us what is our duty in promoting this *interest*. And this will be, not only to preach the word of God with freedom in our several limited departments, but to endeavour to the utmost to remove every obstruction to its *free course* elsewhere, which the selfish policy of this world may have laid in its way, and to bring to light every thing relating to this superior *interest*, which the *temporal interests* of particular societies may dispose them to stifle and to suppress, or to disfigure and misrepresent; remembering, that God would have *all men* to come to the knowledge of the *truth*, as the means of their salvation, and that he hath made no reserve or exception of any sort of men, on account of their unfitness for this knowledge, that will authorise us to keep back any part of it from the meanest christian that lives.

How inconsistent then must it be with the will of God in giving us this gracious dispensation, to block up the free course of his word and his truth, by confining religious doctrines to the terms of an artificial composition, and under the pretence of substituting authentic interpretations of scripture, as standards of orthodox faith for persons of all degrees and capacities, to impose upon christians the notions of men of mere scholastic erudition, expressed in that abstruse, intricate, and technical language to which a large majority of mankind must ever be strangers; and what is even worse, to prevent by various discouragements, in times when all other sorts of knowledge are

increased, that freedom of examination, which might deliver men from a bondage imposed upon them, when the task-masters wanted either the sense and the spirit to examine into the true meaning of the scriptures themselves, or the liberality of mind to permit such examination to others who were better disposed, as well as better qualified.

The first reformers were very sensible how necessary it was that the word of God should have its *free course*, in order to dispel the thick darkness of popery; and they found the amazing effects of that expedient of promoting knowledge, in the number of those who were converted from that wretched compound of tyranny and superstition. The protestant religion in those days was called the gospel, in contrast with the paganish fables, idolatries, and traditions, which made so considerable and essential a part of the popish system. And happy would it have been for the protestant cause, had the conductors of it never been known by any name but that of Evangelics or Gospellers, by which they were at first distinguished. This would at least have reminded them of the impropriety of being divided into sects, from which they adopted so many different denominations, few of whose peculiarities had any countenance in the sacred writings; whence it happened in the end, that what was asserted to glorify the word of God in one society, was understood in another to *debase* and *corrupt* it.

The truth is, the study of the scriptures was, in those days, a new employment. * Men

* Laurentius Valla seems to have been the first who had the courage to rescue the sacred scriptures from the barbarisms of the monks

wanted the proper helps and encouragements, in that sudden emersion from the darkness and ignorance of the foregoing times, with which a farther progress in good learning furnished their successors. Erasmus, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Beza, Martyr, and Bucer abroad, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper, in our country, and many more both at home and abroad, were eminent and valuable men, and pious servants of God, and ever to be honoured for their great services in opening the way for the free course of the word of God, which they found miserably oppressed and obstructed by human traditions. It is nevertheless certain, that there have been in aftertimes men, far below some of them in what are called natural talents, who have made it appear, that their interpretations, in many instances, went upon mistaken grounds: and that the genuine sense of the sacred writers does by no means

and schoolmen. Erasmus found his manuscript, *De collatione Novi Testamenti*, in an old library, in the year 1504, and published it in 1505. This collation relates chiefly to the rectifying the vulgate latin, by comparing it with the original Greek. Erasmus makes great use of this work in his Annotations, and though he frequently finds fault with Valla's interpretations, he does full justice to his merit, particularly in his note upon *Acts* xxii. 9. where he highly commends the diligence of Valla "in investigating what was agree-"ing, or discordant, or corrupted in the sacred writings, seeing that "at the very time Erasmus was writing, there were so many thou-"sands of divines, who were so far from using this method of com-"parison and disquisition, that they did not so much as know in "what language the Apostles wrote." Luther had never seen a bible till the year 1506, when he accidentally met with a latin one in the convent of the Augustines at Erfurd, and found that there were many texts both in the gospels and epistles, which were never read to the people. Luther was then in his twenty-third year.

countenance some of the particular hypotheses which they then espoused.

And yet so it hath happened, that several of these interpretations, expressed in terms borrowed from the logic and philosophy of those times, and drawn up into artificial formularies, not however without considerable variations of one from another, remain to this hour to be the standards of faith and doctrine in particular churches, founded either by these first reformers themselves, or by those who most tenaciously adhered to them in the earlier days of reformation. And when the civil powers presiding in those states and countries where these systems were received respectively, had added the sanction of their authority to them, it became penal in some degree, more or less, to dissent from them; when it was to little purpose for the dissenter to claim the privilege of being concluded by the scripture alone, although all protestant churches had laid that as the foundation of their separating from the church of Rome.

The unchristian persecutions among the protestants themselves, occasioned by these exclusive terms of communion, it is irksome to recollect. The pretence however always was, that the *interests of religion* required this severity to dissenters, which too often only meant the *temporal interests* of that particular church or established society which exercised it, and too often implied an ambition to gain the precedence, and consequently some degree of dominion over the rest.

The obstruction which this discipline would give to the free course of the word of God, or

the knowledge of the truth, is easy to be conceived. Besides the discouragement arising from it to those who would otherwise be inclined to examine whether these things were so, the far greater part, from various motives of fear, indolence, or secular avocations, would set up their rest at once in the prescribed formulary of doctrine and worship, and never think of going to the scriptures as a test of the truth or importance of what their rulers had authorised and established, and what their parents and teachers had been inculcating into them, from their infancy.

But as I have already said, the active mind of man will, as particular occasions and suggestions arise, break through all unnatural restraints, and, where religion is the object of inquiry, will ever be setting the word of God against the authority of man; nor ought we to be either surprised or alarmed that so many controversies have arisen from this freedom of examination. We should rather be thankful for that moderation which, in the present age, hath given way to it. However unedifying religious controversy may be in particular instances, where the invidious and uncharitable reproaches, which the party zeal of contending writers on the one side and the other, mutually create scandal and offence, religious truth is always a gainer in the end; and, though it may seem a paradox to some people who have entertained a different idea, *the true interest of true religion*, or, in other words, *the knowledge of the truth*, hath been an hundred fold more promoted by these liberal disquisitions, than

by all the terrors on the one side, and all the discouragements on the other, which, by the intervention of temporal rewards and penalties, have disposed so large a majority of nominal christians to acquiesce in forms and systems, that persons of very moderate abilities might have discovered (had they turned their attention and endeavours that way) to be very inferior instruments of christian edification, and perhaps, in some instances, not at all related to it.

The prophet Daniel, speaking of evangelical times, says, *many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased,* * a passage which may be understood of the reviviscence of scriptural learning in the fifteenth century, and the progress of it in succeeding times, as well as of any other period. It is still, we may be assured, and will be in a progressive state of increasing till the consummation of this present mundane system.

It becomes us to be attentive to apply those portions of it, which are vouchsafed in our times to their proper use. Among other discoveries of importance, the study of the scriptures hath afforded pretty strong proofs to more persons perhaps than will readily own it, that it is high time to review those forms of doctrine and worship, which our protestant ancestors have left us, to remove some of them, and correct others, as the nature of the case, and the principles of our christian and protestant religion clearly point out.

Many clergymen of the established church,

* Dan. xii. 4.

and some in the most important offices of it, whose learning, piety, and solid judgment were never questioned, have freely acknowledged how sensibly and deeply they had felt the incumbrance that these mistaken expedients of human wisdom laid upon them, in the several branches of their ordinary ministrations. And, however we may find ourselves affected in that respect, it behoves every serious and conscientious minister among us, not only to be earnest in his private supplications to the God of truth, but to be ready to join in all lawful and prudent endeavours, consistent with the respect we owe to those who have the rule over us, that a more liberal and christian policy may speedily take place in our particular department, that the word of God preached by us may have its free course, and its full effect, which we can hardly hope for, wherever it is under the restraints and drawbacks that the spirit of the world is too apt to lay upon it, under the plausible, but false pretence of promoting the INTERESTS OF RELIGION.

DISCOURSE IV.

On the original principles of the first Protestants.

WHEN, by the means of an happy revolution in our government in the year 1688, the free subjects of this kingdom recovered the legal enjoyment of their civil rights and privileges, which had for some years backward been unwarrantably infringed by various exertions of arbitrary power, it came to be considered, among other provisions for their future security, what was due to the rights of conscience, and what the protestant religion, the legal and established religion of our country, prescribed and required on that behalf.

One effect of this disquisition was, the toleration of protestants dissenting from the ecclesiastical forms of worship and discipline of the church of England as by law established. The propriety of these forms and this discipline had been discussed in long and bitter controversies, between churchmen and dissenters, from the early days of queen Elizabeth, down to the period just mentioned; and the inforcing conformity to them by penal and incapacitating laws, had created a variety of evils, which had

more than once endangered the stability of civil government, without any abatement of that party zeal on either side, by which the contest was kept alive and fomented.

The healing spirit of king William considered these matters in their true light, and a set of moderate divines, animated by his encouragement and example, examining these causes of offence and scandal, without those prepossessions which had incumbered their predecessors, candidly acknowledged, that however insignificant or unreasonable the objections of the nonconformists might be in some instances, there were others in which they were both reasonable and important. It was allowed, that some of the forms by law established, were unedifying at the best, that others were exceptionable on different accounts, and that the reformation of these was "desirable," as the good bishop Burnet expressed it, "though there were not a dissenter "in the nation."*

From that time the expedience of correcting and amending our established forms, not only of worship and discipline, but of doctrine also, has been the subject of many tracts and discourses written by men of different denominations, who have, in their turn, been opposed and censured with warmth and acrimony by those, who, for particular reasons, have thought any alterations in our ecclesiastical system not only unnecessary, but dangerous to religion itself.

The progress of scriptural learning, and the free discussion of the nature and extent of

* Concluſion of the hiſtory of his own times.

christian liberty, seem at length to have given the solicitors for a revisal and correction of our established forms, the advantage of the argument. The danger to religion, supposed to arise from such correction of forms of human composition, hath appeared to be founded on a prejudice, which would have operated equally against our reformation from popery, and even againt the reception of the christian religion, considered in contrast with the state of the jewish religion, and of the superstitions and idolatries of the gentile world, at the time of our Saviour's appearance. And it is now well known, that great numbers are convinced, that a reformation of our established forms is in itself both reasonable and desirable, who, however, endeavour to persuade themselves and others, *that the times are not favourable to such an undertaking.**

* This may be explained to mean, either that the people in general are averse to such reformation, and that the consequences of attempting it would be schism in the church, or faction in the state, destructive of public peace; or that our governors in church and state are, *for some other reasons*, unwilling to undertake it. The variety of sects among us, and the numbers who are attached to them respectively, render this supposed general aversion to the alteration of our present system not a little disputable, especially as one principal object of such alteration should be, the reconciliation of all serious, candid, and reasonable protestants to the public forms of doctrine and worship, by making such abatements in the present exclusive terms of church membership, as might, in agreement with the fundamental principles of the protestant religion, admit all who *hold the head*, to a participation of the privileges and benefits, *now* appropriated to conformity *only*. As to reasons of any other sort, we are obliged to think honourably of our governors, and to conclude, that they would not decline so considerable a service to the truly religious and conscientious part of their subjects, for any reasons that are merely of the political sort. Much less, on that principle, that *the civil magistrate hath an absolute right to establish what religion he thinks proper.*

There are however, it seems, others who think that attempts which have so plain a tendency to give a greater degree of consistency to our protestant profession, and at the same time to promote the influence of the spirit and power of the christian religion, ought not to be accommodated to times and seasons, which perhaps may never happen. And under this persuasion, a few of the clergy of the establishment, being joined by some laygentlemen of the liberal professions, sensible of the distresses of ingenuous minds occasioned by subscriptions to human forms of dubious authority, took the courage to make a trial towards obtaining some relief in that article of ministerial and academical discipline; and, for that purpose, about the beginning of the last year,* offered a petition to the house of commons, which, after a solemn and important debate, was rejected by a considerable majority.

There were others of the clergy, who, though they wanted and wished for relief, and that in instances to which the prayer of the above-mentioned petition did not extend, did not approve of the mode of application to which their brethren had recourse. They thought it more decent to make their suit to their ecclesiastical superiors in the first place. What were their sentiments of the merits of their cause, and what were the motives for chusing

* The civil magiſtrate in this chriſtian and proteſtant country, thank God, profeſſeth no ſuch maxim, however it may have been ſuggeſted to him by particular perſons, who may hope to find their private account in having our eccleſiaſtical ſyſtem continued in its preſent unedifying ſtate.

this method of advancing it, may be understood from the contents of a sensible and candid little tract, published by the reverend and worthy clergyman who is said to have first proposed this application to their lordships the bishops, in preference to that of the petitioners to parliament.*

The respectable persons who went upon this plan, were not, however, more fortunate than they who made the former attempt. It has never clearly appeared for what particular reasons they miscarried. It is said a general answer was given them, that their request could not either with safety or propriety be complied with.† And from whatever class of our superiors we receive such information, it becomes us to presume that their reasons for declining to lend their aid on such occasions, are of the most cogent and satisfactory kind.

When the determinations of our superiors in church and state, upon this or any other subject of public importance, come to be known, whether the grounds on which they proceed are understood or not, writers of all classes and degrees of ability, rise up in defence of them. A man, who knows he has a numerous and powerful majority on his side, enters the lists with confidence and alacrity. Whatever his private views or motives may be, he suppo-

* Mr. Wollaston, to whom the public is said to be indebted for some seasonable and important *queries relating to the book of Common Prayer, &c. addressed to those in authority.*

† See an excellent pamphlet, intituled, *The State of Subscription to the Articles and Liturgy of the Church of England, towards the close of the year* 1773. *Recommended to the most serious attention of the three Estates of the Realm*, p. 36, 37.

ses credit will be given him for the soundness of his principles, the strength of his arguments, the authenticity of his facts, and his candor in characterising his adversaries. He gives himself honour and consequence in setting up for the defender of statesmen and prelates, and imagines he runs no risque of being disowned, even though perhaps he is going upon grounds which they never thought of, and which they would, upon occasion, utterly disavow, as inconsistent with those principles of justice and decorum, which should influence them in their several relations to the public.

Of this family of defenders have arisen of late one or two, who merit our especial notice, as, in their zeal to silence the importunity of those who call for reformation in the church, they have thought fit to adopt a system, which has but too much resemblance to that of the sceptical Mr. Hobbes, and in order to cut short the dispute with men who give them so much trouble while the contest is carried on upon protestant principles, make no scruple to place the protestant establishment of the church of England, upon the same foundation with the establishments of popery and paganism, consigning the government of christians and protestants in matters of religion, to the civil magistrate, with the same plenitude of power that a Julian, a Mahomet, or a Leo have arrogated to themselves in their respective administrations of ecclesiastical polity.

The tendency of this doctrine to overthrow every claim, and every advantage which the protestant churches of Europe, and the church of England among the rest, derive from their

scriptural right of departing from the errors and usurpations of popery, will not permit us to pay these gentlemen the compliment they may expect, of being defenders of our church establishment. They may be zealous and very sincere enemies to all who petition for, or otherwise wish to bring about a revisal of our ecclesiastical forms and ordinances. They may be useful partizans in annoying those who pretend to disturb what they please to call the peace of the church. But let it not be imagined that they advance this desperate plea upon the authority, or with the countenance of our civil or ecclesiastical governors. There could not be a more injurious reflection cast upon them, than to suppose they so little understand the principles of the constitution over which they preside; not to mention the very different sentiments which some illustrious names among them have repeatedly expressed.*

Considering then this modern doctrine as the mere conceit of one or two particular writers,

* Besides those great names among our prelates and dignified divines, who have formerly borne their testimony to the expedience of an ecclesiastical reformation of the established church, there are others still living who have not shunned to declare their judgment on this interesting subject. The learned bishop Louth's Visitation Sermon has benn too often quoted, to permit the generous sentiments of so able and eminent a writer to remain in obscurity. And more lately some masterly and valuable *considerations on the propriety of requiring Subscription to Articles of Faith*, first printed at Cambridge, and since at London in this present year 1774, are known to come from the benevolent hand of a worthy prelate, whose labours have been for a long course of years peculiarly appropriated to the service of sound learning and true religion, and to the abatement of those unmanly and unchristian prejudices that have obstructed the progress of them in former times, the pernicious influence of which prevails but too much in the present.

whose ends might not be so well answered by meeting their adversaries on the common principles of the protestant religion, and who may sooner find their account in amusing the lookers on with a little ingenious sophistry, than in convincing their understandings by solid reasoning, permit me to examine it on the same footing, and with the same freedom, as one would do any other doctrine tending to undermine the truth, the importance and authority of our holy religion, and, without defending, or even apologising for those persons who have solicited a reformation in ecclesiastical matters, on account of some supposed impropriety in the manner of their application, to endeavour to obviate the prejudice and scandal which a principle of this sort, if considered as a principle acknowledged by the church of England, must unavoidably fix upon it, with all serious and impartial judges of the subject to which it is applied.

The province of the civil magistrate, with respect to religious establishments founded on the principles of christianity, has been so accurately marked out by some of our most eminent authors, particularly by Mr. Locke and bishop Hoadly, whose writings are in every one's hands, that it will be sufficient to refer to them for the theoretic part of the question. Our present inquiry shall be confined to the matter of fact, laying it down as a fundamental one, that the church of England claims to be a protestant church, whence it will follow of course, that the province of the civil magistrate in the government and protection of it, must be limited by such circumstances as are consistent with that claim.

The intervention of the states of the kingdom at the revolution to take the government out of the hands of King James II. who so notoriously transgressed those limits, is a demonstrative proof, that this is an authentic maxim of the British constitution. And that this was not an occasional doctrine taken up through the mere necessity of the times, appeared from what was advanced nine or ten years before, when the bill of exclusion was in debate, and when both the arguments for a total exclusion, and those which were only for limitations of the successor's power, tended to prove that, "upon the principles of the protestant constitution, all power in ecclesiastical matters "ought to be taken out of the hands, even "where the law had lodged it, when there was "manifest danger that such power would be "abused."*

And that this continues to be the constitutional doctrine of this kingdom at this time, appears from one of the latest occasions of asserting it, when one of the greatest ornaments of our municipal law that ever presided in that department, delivered the following *instructive lesson*, as he called it, to an august assembly, and on a very solemn occasion.

"It deserves the serious attention of the "whole nation," says this great man, "of "what important consequence it is to preserve, "not only the name and outward form of the "protestant religion amongst us, but the *real* "*uniform belief and practice of it.* Indifference to all religion prepares men for the ex-

* Burnet's Hist. O. T. folio, p. 455—460, vol. i.

" ternal profession of any; and what may not
" that lead to? Give me leave to affirm be-
" fore this great assembly, that even, ab-
" stracted from religious considerations, the
" protestant religion ought to be had in the
" highest reverence, as the surest barrier of
" our civil constitution. Ecclesiastical usur-
" pation seldom fails to end in civil tyranny.
" The present happy settlement of the crown
" is in truth, and not in name only, the PRO-
" TESTANT SUCCESSION."*

This illustrious testimony given to the importance of the protestant religion, being delivered before both houses of parliament, needed no farther sanction either to establish the matter of fact, or to justify the consequences drawn from it. This is the doctrine upon which our ecclesiastical, as well as our civil, constitution is built and supported. An establishment, subject to the mere will and pleasure of any human power, is not a protestant establishment. Ecclesiastical usurpation may be exercised by civil, as well as ecclesiastical superiors, and in either case will equally end in civil tyranny. According to this great authority, our supreme civil magistrate must be a PROTESTANT *in truth*, as well as *in name*. It is upon that consideration, that the important trust is committed to him. And his subjects, if they would reap the full benefit of this provision for their security and happiness, must be attentive to preserve, not only the *name* and *outward form* of the protestant religion, but the *real uniform belief and practice of it*. To rest

* Lord Hardwicke's speech, at the end of Lord Lovat's trial.

in the mere name and outward form, is to betray an indifference to all religion, and that, we see, prepares men for the external profession of any, be it Popery, Mahometism, or Paganism itself, in one word, of any religion or superstition which any civil magistrate may think fit to establish.

So different were the sentiments of this eminent man, and his noble audience, from the servile maxims of these modern retailers of ecclesiastical polity, who, after all, would perhaps be the first to exclaim against the practical consequences of their own doctrine, should the civil magistrate take them at their word. History hath recorded how profuse their predecessors were in professing their obedience and submission to James II. till the oppression was brought home to themselves; and then they were glad to avail themselves of those expedients of deliverance, which could only be procured for them upon principles that had been the object of their anathemas.

From this view of our constitutional privileges, we are naturally led to inquire in the next place, what is the true description of the protestant religion, and how the religion professed and understood to be established in these kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland, came by that name.

The general, and perhaps the most commonly received idea of the protestant religion, is that of a religion which is opposite to popery, so far as relates to the renouncing of those erroneous doctrines and superstitious rites and ordinances, which specifically distinguish the church of Rome, from our own and other

churches that separated from her in the sixteenth century, without considering the objections that arise from the examination of that power, by which such errors and superstitions were imposed upon a christian people.

It is true, these errors and superstitions could not be renounced, without renouncing in some degree, at the same time, the authority that imposed them. But being considered, at the first, merely as doctrinal errors, and traditional excrescencies, which might be reformed without revolting from the papal government, the extent of the pope's authority did not so early come in question. Luther himself, at the disputation he held with Eccius and others at Leipsic in the year 1519, allowed, that, supposing the church to be *civile corpus*, (which he does not appear to have controverted at that time) the pope was oecumenical pontiff.* What he questioned was, whether he was so *jure divino?* If not, the reformation of corruptions, errors, and abuses in the church might be reformed without the violation of the pope's governmental authority. But if, on the other hand, the pope's divine right to the headship of the church could be proved by the scriptures, his ordinances and institutions would then stand upon the footing of infallibility; and none of his doctrines or rites could be impeached of error or superstition, nor any disobedience to his decrees justified, in whatever respect they might appear to be contrary to the scripture.

* See Melancthon's Letter to Oecolampadius concerning the conference at Leipsic, anno 1519, apud Dan. Gerdesium Hist. Evang. Renovat. p. 203.

Thus was the matter understood at that time; but in the progress of examination, the reformers grew wiser. They found that the church of Christ is a *spiritual body*, of which Christ alone is the head; and that the pretended authority of the pope in matters of faith and conscience, was a mere usurpation. It is however to be observed, that the name of protestant was not yet appropriated to the party which favoured Luther's reformation.

That denomination was given them on the following occasion. In the year 1526, religious disputes running high in Germany, and the Emperor Charles V. being embroiled with the pope, and at that time absent in Spain, his commissioners at the diet then held at Spire, found it convenient to agree to an edict, importing, "that until either a general or national council might be assembled, all parties "should behave themselves in their several "stations and provinces, that they might be "able to give a good account of themselves "and their doings, both to God and the Emperor."*

This edict was understood to leave all parties the free exercise of their religion by making them answerable only to God for their sincerity in professing it, and to the Emperor only for their behaviour, as obedient and peaceable subjects of the state.

But in the year 1529, Ferdinand the Emperor's brother, in another diet assembled likewise at Spire, procured an edict wherein it was decreed, that "the doctrine of those who

* Sleidan, B. vi.

" dissented from the church of Rome about " the sacrament of the Lord's supper, should " not be tolerated, neither the mass abolished; " —that ministers should preach according to " the sense and interpretation of scripture ap- " proved by the church, and that no prince or " state of the empire should take into their " protection the subjects of other jurisdictions, " who should take refuge with them upon ac- " count of religion."

The favourers of reformation considering this edict as an infringement upon that of 1526, the Elector of Saxony, the Marquis of Brandenburgh, the Dukes of Lunenbergh and Zell, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Count of Anhalt, and fourteen of the free cities of Germany, *protested* against it, and from thence acquired the name of PROTESTANTS, which afterwards was applied to all who separated from the church of Rome.

The protestation of these princes and states, besides some arguments drawn from the unseasonableness of the edict, with respect to the public peace, was in substance as follows.

"The *protesters* were ready, after the ex- " ample of their ancestors, to contribute to " the support and dignity of the Emperor to " the utmost of their strength and substance; " but desired that their present dissent might " not be ill taken, as this was a matter which " *concerned the eternal salvation of all men.* " They could not recede from what they had " already done in the work of reformation, nor " could bind themselves from going farther, " without a reflection upon the doctrine they

" had hitherto held sacred and true, and de-
" nying the pure and uncorrupted word of
" God, which they had espoused for their rule
" of faith and practice. They could not im-
" plicitly submit to the traditions and inter-
" pretations of the church, unless it could be
" proved to be the true church. That since
" no doctrine could be more certain than that
" of God's word, and that no doctrine should
" be taught besides it, the obscure places of
" scripture could not be better explained or
" illustrated, than by such passages as were
" clear and plain. That therefore they were
" determined to pursue that method, and to do
" their endeavour, that the Old and New Tes-
" taments should be taught in purity and
" with perspicuity. That this was the only
" plain and undeniable ground to be relied
" upon, the traditions of men having no solid
" foundation whatever.*

To these principles the protestants adhered in all their conflicts with the Emperor in matters of religion, and when afterwards they broke into parties among themselves, these were the principles to which they mutually appealed. And as the edict here opposed wanted none of the formalities of a solemn ordinance of the state, this protestation plainly shews, what the sentiments of these princes and free cities were, concerning the extent of the authority of the civil magistrate, professing the same christianity with themselves, in matters of religion.†

* Sleidan, B. vi.

† " It was an opinion," says bishop Burnet, " common enough
" at that time, that the Emperor was sovereign of Germany:—

It would be no difficult matter to shew, that what I have cited from that eminent patriot so

" Whereas, by the conſtitutions and laws of the empire, the Princes " had reſerved to themſelves the right of coining, fortifying, arming, " and entering into treaties, not only with one another, but with fo- " reign princes for their defence. A homage was indeed due to the " Emperor, and a much greater ſubmiſſion was due to the diet of the " empire; but the princes were ſovereigns in their own territories, " and the Hans Towns were free States." *Hiſt. Reform.* vol. iii. p. 112. ed. 1715. The following quotation affords an additional proof of the limitation of the Emperor's power, even in the eſtimation of an Emperor. *Cum imperator Maximilianus fœdus ini et cum venetianis, tres, dixit reges eſſe in orbe chriſtiano, ſeipſum, ſciliſcet, regem Franciæ, et regem Angliæ ſeipſum, dixit, regem eſſe regum, etenim, quod principibus ſuis mandaverit, ſi illis viſum eſt, voluntatem ſuam exequebantur, ſin aliter, omnino neglexerunt. Quo ſignificavit, principes nunquam ſubjectos fuiſſe imperator, ſed pro Cubitu ſuo equiſſe quod inus placuit.—Luth. Coll. Mens. Angl.* 463. But the Emperor's pretenſions, as we are informed by Bodin, went far beyond this puny ſovereignty over Germany. It was made a queſtion among the Civilians, *an ſunt hæretici qui negant imperatorem Germanicum univerſi terrarum orbis eſſe dominum.* De Rep. I. 1. ch. ix. § xxii. Of this opinion, it ſeems, was the famous lawyer Bartolus. This was ſecuring the Emperor's authority in religious matters with a witneſs. I have not Bodin's book at hand, and take this particular from *Werdenhagen's Synopſis*, p. 327, which ſays nothing of the extent of the Emperor's dominion, but only laments the abuſe of the word *hereſy*, when applied to ſuch ſubjects. Bodin, indeed, ſeems to queſtion the ſovereignty of the princes of Germany, and, according to his Epitomizer, ſays, " if theſe princes had the rights of ſovereignty [*majeſtatis*] abſo- " lutely, there could be no miſtake about it; but as they accept of " judges from the imperial diet and are obliged to ſubmit to that " juriſdiction, they muſt give up this pretenſion." *Id. ibid.* ch. xxi. and in the preceding chapter he confines them to much fewer privileges than biſhop Burnet aſſigns them. However, that the diet itſelf had no authority to controul the princes or the free cities within their reſpective juriſdictions, appears from this very proteſtation. The edict pretended to preſcribe whom they ſhould or ſhould not receive into their reſpective territories, and ſome other things which ſeemed to encroach on their peculiar prerogatives. To which they anſwer: *Quod autem præſcribant, quid ſuis ipſi populis mandare,*

long and so worthily at the head of the law, exactly corresponds with the idea of the protestant religion exhibited in this remonstrance

et quas in suis ditionibus ferre debeant leges, valde se mirari, præsertim cum ipsi minime sint passuri, si quis hoc invicem apud eos tentaret. The remaining question then is, what power or authority these princes and free cities had of establishing religion within their own territories respectively? Now the foundation on which they claimed this authority, independent of the Emperor and the diet, was, that religion is a matter *which concerns the eternal salvation of all men*, i. e. of every man, considered in his personal capacity. Accordingly, the subjects of these princes respectively might, with equal reason, plead the same privilege against them, in case any of them should, upon examining the scriptures for themselves, find reason to dissent from the public establishment. The princes, we see, in this protestation, pretend not to establish any thing, but that the scriptures should be taught in purity and with perspicuity. This they might probably think was afterwards sufficiently done in the Augustan Confession, and they might at that early period imagine, that their authority reached to the imposing this confession on their people, as the pure and perspicuous word of God, and the requiring also an assent to it of all who should become parties to their religious league. We shall see hereafter what our King Henry VIII. said to this. All this however was overthrown by Melancthon at the dispute held at Leipsic in 1541, when he so well distinguished between the political government of the magistrate, and the government of the church where Christ is the head, and the scriptures the code of laws. He there shewed, that christians had a right of private judgment, which not only exempted them from the authoritative decisions of popes and councils, of emperors and diets, but from those of any other civil jurisdiction whatever. *Porro*, says he, *sæpe accidit in instauratione ecclesiæ, ut unus aut pauci privati renovarint doctrinam, et reprehenderint falsas persuasiones pontificum et reliquæ multitudinis quæ dominabatur, ut* Elias, Esaias, Jeremias, *et* Johannes Baptista, *ab ordinaria potestate, et a multitudine dissenserunt.* But these, it might be said, were extraordinary cases, and therefore he adds, *et quidem mandatum Dei de confessione doctrinæ, cogit singulos recte sentientes, testari quod sentiunt, et, ubi vocatio requirit, contradicere multitudini et gubernatoribus erantibus.* See his epistles, Lond. 1642, p. 79, 80. If it should be asked who are these *recte sentientes*, it is sufficient to answer, they who prefer and oppose the pure word of God, to the artificial compositions of men.

of these protestant princes. *Indifference,* and *external profession,* are manifestly opposed to *study* and *personal examination* on the one hand, and on the other, to the *internal adherence* to the grand protestant rule of faith and practice, the holy scriptures. Which will farther appear by a short detail of what has happened in our own country, from the times when these foreign princes were asserting their religious rights, against the ecclesiastical and civil powers then in being.

From the reign of King Henry the eighth to the settlement under King William, the extent of the civil magistrate's authority, in matters of religion, was never perhaps thoroughly canvassed upon the principles of the protestant reformation. Different systems were laid down by different writers, who, though they did not professedly write against each other, exhibited sentiments respectively, which could not by any means be reconciled to each other.

King Henry had the supremacy in ecclesiastical matters vested in him, by an act of the state; and though we may presume he would not have taken patiently a protestation from his own subjects, conceived in such terms as that of the protestant princes of Germany, yet the matter of fact is, that he was contented to receive it with this limitation, *so far as is agreeable to the laws of Christ:* and with the same limitation it must be understood to belong to his successors. For as bishop Burnet observes, "though these words of limitation had not "been added, the nature of things required "that they should have been supposed; since, "among christians, all authority must be un-

" derstood to be limited by the laws that " Christ has given."* But what of this supre-

* Hiſt. Reform. vol. iii. p. 53. The biſhop adds however, " It " ſeems the King thought it was of great advantage to him to have " this matter ſettled with any limitation; for that in time would be " dropped and forgotten, as indeed it was," which is only to be underſtood of this particular reign. For our proteſtant princes ſtill kept up the diſtinction, by the words, *next under Chriſt*, as in the 36th of King Edward's Articles, and the explanation added in the reviſed articles of Queen Elizabeth. King Henry, however, acknowledged the limitation in moſt expreſs terms, when ſixteen years afterwards, the proteſtant princes of Germany demanding of him, as a condition of their alliance with him, " that the King would ſet " forth the true doctrine of Chriſt, according to the Augſburgh " confeſſion." He anſwered, " that he intended to ſet forth the true " doctrine of Chriſt, which he was ready to defend with life and " goods. But that he being reckoned ſomewhat learned, and ha- " ving many learned men in his kingdom, he did not think it meet " to accept at any creature's hands the obſerving of his and his " realm's faith, the only ground whereof remaineth in the ſcripture." Ibid. p. 115. The Elector of Saxony's opinion of King Henry was, that he was an " impious man, with whom he deſired to have " no commerce. He was no better than the pope, whoſe yoke he " had thrown off only for his own ends; and that he intended out " of the two religions to make a third, only for enriching himſelf, " having condemned the principal points of their doctrine in parlia- " ment." Burnet, u. s. p. 166. Seckendorf gives the Elector's " opinion of King Henry more at length." *Angliæ regem, pro hoſte evangelicæ doctrinæ habebat, qui nihil in reformatione præſtitiſſet, quam ut ſe caput eccleſiæ conſtitueret, ad quod a Deo non eſſet vocatus, interim in pios chriſtianos tyrannicè ſæviat, et flagitioſè vivat, in omnibus denique rebus tantum ſua quærat commoda,—qua propter nihil boni ſe ab illo ſperare poſſe dicebat.* Lib. iii. p. 552. col. 2. ſub anno. 1545. One might perhaps ſay upon this occaſion, *Illiacos intra muros peccatur et extra.* Perhaps the Elector did not ſo far forget his duty as to turn perſecutor, but doubtleſs he and his aſſociates claimed ſome ſome ſort of headſhip in eccleſiaſtical affairs within their ſeveral juriſdictions, and particularly in eſtabliſhing the Augſburgh confeſſion, in which they forgot their proteſtant principle, as much as Henry forgot his anſwer to them, *that he would not receive his faith from any creature*, when he eſtabliſhed the ſix articles. Biſhop Burnet ſays of King Henry, " that he ſeemed to think his ſubjects owed an en- " tire reſignation of their reaſons and conſciences to him." *u. s.* p.

macy was or was not agreeable to the laws of Christ, though occasionally the subject of much altercation, was never authoritatively determined, except by particular acts wherein it was exercised, without however drawing the line where that exercise should stop.

From the reformation to the revolution, there was no express law to exclude papists from succeeding to the crown of these realms. The law abolishing the papal power, did not imply such exclusion. For we see king Henry continued attached to the superstitions of the popish church to the end of his life, persecuting those, by virtue of his headship, who refused to conform to his six articles, and those particularly who took any effectual steps towards a farther reformation.

It hath been said, crudely enough, that the supremacy conferred upon our sovereigns, is the same in all respects, as that of which the pope was deprived at the time of King Henry's separation from him. But this is by no means consistent with one of the reasons given for that deprivation, namely, that the pope had no authority to decree or dispense with any thing contrary to the word of God. It is possible some of our protestant princes, particularly Queen Elizabeth, may be thought not to have

137. and again, p. 153, "the King acted as if he had a mind to "be thought infallible." But the constitutional limits of this headship are not to be taken from the caprice and inconsistency of this King's disposition. Nor is it to be imagined, that King Henry himself was always unmindful of the restriction under which it was conferred and accepted; for in this very page, where he is represented as setting up for infallibility, we are referred to a paper in the collection of Records, No. 70, where the King demands scripture proof of the articles concerning *Extreme Unction, Confirmation, &c.*

always paid sufficient regard to the above-mentioned limitations of her power in ecclesiastical matters. This, however, (being perhaps one of those tender points which the expediences of government required to be kept out of sight) never came to a legal discussion, till King James II.'s attempts upon the protestant religion rendered it a necessary object of the attention of the legislature.

The matter, indeed, had been debated in controversial writings, from very early times after the reformation, chiefly with the papists. The dissenters also, or as they were then called, the Puritans, frequently brought the subject into view, in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, King James I. and King Charles I. But their tenets in matters merely political, being likewise obnoxious to those princes respectively, their remonstrances were overruled with an high hand, nor were their arguments ever sufficiently attended to, till the ruling powers were unhappily involved in the mischief occasioned by their too obstinate adherence to the contrary doctrine.

Upon the restoration of King Charles II. while the government was apprehended to be in some danger from the remains of a party so lately subdued, accommodations were proposed, and concessions made, in words, at least, which bore some kind of resemblance to the protestant principle. But the government feeling by degrees its own strength, and they who had suffered by the ordinances of preceding times, being in haste to retaliate upon the fallen party, all considerations tending to moderate counsels, even those suggested by our

common christianity, were superseded by the numbers and spirit of those whose chief object was the humiliation of dissenters from the establishment.

In the progress of that reign, however, the ill effects of this mistaken policy began to be felt, when it was too late to correct it by the lenient and equitable expedients of a protestant government. The debates upon the bill of exclusion, and more particularly the arguments used for limiting the powers of the successor in prospect, in matters ecclesiastical, discovered the general sense of the protestant part of the nation on this article of the royal prerogative. Many reflections occur on these remarkable incidents in our history. Among others it may be observed, that they who opposed both these measures, as offering some sort of violence to our civil constitution, were not aware that the excess of their predilection for a compulsive uniformity in religion, had brought on a necessity for some restrictions of this kind upon a successor, who made no secret of his attachment to the political and ecclesiastical principles of the popish system. But when the wisdom of these cautionary proposals was completely justified by the practices of King James II. it was then seen and confessed on all hands, that what had been called *wholesome severities*, were equally iniquitous and detestable, whether inflicted by the governors of a popish or a protestant church.

It is by no means peculiar to our own times, that ambitious men are found to attach themselves to the dictates of the ruling powers, even in matters of religion, without sufficient regard

to their prior obligations to the precepts of Christ. It is an infirmity common to some men in every class, and in every country, and has been the infirmity of churchmen as well as others, and was remarkably and unhappily so in the reign of King Charles II.

From the time that the usurpations of the church of Rome were found to have no warrant or foundation in the word of God, all serious and consistent protestants have held, that Christ being the head of the church, they to whom the government of it should be intrusted on earth, should act in subordination to the laws and rules he hath left for that purpose, consequently that the liberty of christians could not righteously be restrained to narrower bounds, than Christ their head prescribed: a matter which was so clearly deduced from the accounts we have of his doctrine and practice in the scriptures of the New Testament, that there was no opposing it, but by denying that Christ is the head of the church.

Accordingly, the ecclesiastical proceedings under the government of King Charles II. being upon this protestant maxim totally indefensible, certain ecclesiastics of those times scrupled not to ascribe to the civil magistrate an authority in matters of religion, independent of any subordination to the laws of Christ; and one of them in particular* "was "not ashamed to exalt the King's authority "in matters of religion in so indecent a man-"ner," (to use the expression of bishop Burnet) "that he condemned the ordinary form

* Dr Samuel Parker.

" of saying the King was under God and " Christ, as a crude and profane expression, " saying, that though the King was under " God, yet he was not under Christ, but " above him."*

The doctrine then in fashion, though carried to great lengths of extravagance, was indeed held and taught by others in more decent terms, but was however in general unsupportable by any position short of that of this rash Divine. They held equally with him, " that " it was necessary to the peace and govern- " ment of the world, that the supreme magis- " trate of every commonwealth should be vest- " ed with a power to govern and conduct the " consciences of his subjects in the affair of re- " ligion." This, they appear to have thought, was consistent with the headship of Christ over the church. But this bold man, who did not want abilities, saw the infirmity of the connection, and affirmed, " that the doctrine " which introduced the headship of Christ " over his church, by way of interfering with " the magistrate in matters of religion and " conscience, was a fanatical doctrine, and " had almost persuaded the princes of Europe " that christianity was an enemy to govern- " ment."†

And when these princes should be so persuaded, there was surely nothing to hinder them from establishing what religion they thought would be more commodious for their government than christianity. And if popery

* Burnet, Hiſt. O. T. fol. vol. i. p. 696.

† See Parker's Anſwer to the Rehearſal Tranſproſed.

should appear to be such religion, in what were Queen Mary or King James II. to blame for in using their authority to establish popery? And how shall we excuse our predecessors of the last age from the guilt of rebellion, who, in consequence of their christian and protestant principles, took the government out of the hands of the latter, and settled, for all time to come, a succession of supreme magistrates upon the indispensable condition, that they should be *protestants in truth as well as in name*, and whose subjects should from thenceforward have a right to be governed in matters of religion, upon truly christian and protestant principles?

And now that our protestant church is founded upon this basis, and effectually, rescued, as we trust, from the perils to which these now exploded politics once exposed it, it must be no little surprize to the present generation, and particularly to a protestant clergy, to find that, according to the doctrine of one of their own order, our present church establishment cannot be defended, but upon principles which would equally justify the establishment of popery, paganism, or in one word, the establishment of every religion under heaven.

If you should inquire of what materials this general defence of all establishments consists, you will find it rests upon the doctrine abovementioned, so much in vogue before the revolution, namely, upon the absolute power of the civil magistrate to govern and conduct the consciences of his subjects according to his discretion; and the steps by which we are led to this conclusion, are such as these.

" The use of reason in religion is to be de-
" nied to the bulk of mankind, because they
" cannot use it.* It is scarce possible to name
" or invent an opinion more absurd in itself,
" or more hurtful to society, or more fatal to
" the cause of piety and virtue, than many of
" those which have been actually maintained
" by men, who called themselves christians.
" —The reformed religion, through the folly
" of some, and the knavery of others, has too
" often proved fatal to the power of the state.†

* The Jesuit Wadingus was of the same opinion. " *Illa fides* " *merito suspecta esse debet, in qua regula credendi plebeis est im-* " *possibilis.* Meaning, by *illa fides*, the protestant faith, and by *regula credendi*, the holy scriptures. And his instance is, that no Plebeian, reading the words ascribed to Christ, *Whosoever sins ye remit, &c.* in the vulgar tongue, can be certain, either that the words were spoken by our Saviour, or that they are to be understood of a power to forgive sins. What Episcopius said to this, may be seen in his answer to Wadingus's epistle. But the Plebeian should have some certainty that his faith is such as ought not to be suspected; how shall he obtain it? " By trusting in the church," says the Jesuit. " Excuse me," says Dr. Balguy, " the civil ma-" gistrate is the only proper judge in this case." Which of them shall we believe? *Vid. Episcopii, op. vol. i. part ii. p.* 97. *Amst.* 1650.

† The argument stands thus: There are knaves and fools in some parts of the world. *Ergo*, the christian or the protestant religion ought not to be established, but where there are no knaves or fools. Well, what is to be substituted in their stead, where knavery and folly abound? The answer is, whatever religion the civil magistrate thinks proper. But how if the civil magistrate himself should be either a knave or a fool? " A mere Bagatelle," must the Doctor answer, " the state would still be safe while the magistrate " had the ordering of the forms of religion." Perhaps not. Many a tyrant has been demolished without any aid from religious knaves or fools. True it is indeed, that the protestant religion was fatal to the power of the state of our James II. But some people are simple enough to believe, that the folly and knavery was then all on the side of the magistrate.—Will the Doctor be pleased to name another instance? It is no argument of the *knavery* or *folly* of the reformed religion, that it has been unfavourable to civil tyranny.

" *Therefore,* as all forms of religion ought not " to be favoured equally by the civil magis- " trate, the civil magistrate is the only proper " judge to what forms the preference is due.* " He is equally a judge of the evidence by which " the opinions of men are to be known. Sub- " scription to the scriptures is absolutely no- " thing, or in other words, no evidence of mens " opinions."† And if you add to this what the

* This puts one in mind of what the famous *Æneas Sylvius* once said to one of his correspondents, when the dispute ran high, whether secular princes might lawfully call general councils, or whether that power was in the pope alone. *Non video clericos qui velint pro istâ vel illâ* [sententiâ] *martyrium ferre. Omnes hanc fidem habemus quam nostri principes, qui si colerent idola, nos coleremus; et non solum Papam, sed Christum etiam negaremus, seculari potestate urgente.* I should certainly have recommended this as an authority in point to our ingenious opponent, had not Sylvius immediately added an unlucky reason for this clerical complaisance, viz. *Quia refriguit charitas, et omnis interiit fides.* Æn. Sylv. Epist. 54.

† By what sort of evidence the opinions of men are to be known, should, I apprehend, have been stated, before it had been determined who is the proper judge of it; the rather, as men may entertain opinions, of which no human means can come at the evidence, and consequently, of which no mortal man can judge; and something very like this is said in more than one passage of scripture. But let us proceed as well as we can with the materials before us. " Subscrip- " tion to the scriptures, is absolutely no evidence of men's opinions." We are now debating a point which presupposeth the establishment of the christian and protestant religion; and ask why will not such subscription be evidence of the subscriber's opinions? The answer must be that stale one, that though such subscription may be evidence of the man's general belief of the scriptures, yet it is no evidence of his opinions concerning particular doctrines of those scriptures. To remedy this default, the magistrate draws out *his own* opinions upon paper, and requires the man, of whose opinions he wants competent evidence, to subscribe them; and having obtained the subscription, he is supposed to be satisfied, that the subscriber's opinions and his own are exactly the same. But if we are to believe this advocate, his conclusion may be too hasty. There are such things, it seems, among even the reformed, as *folly* and *knavery*, and that in such abundance as to be too often fatal to the power of the state. A *fool*

same author says in another of his performances, namely, "that we should in vain look into "the scriptures for a proper model of church "government," you will have the exact features of that *ecclesiastical polity* above described, and calculated for the reign of Charles II. and his immediate successor, and consequently to countenance and abet the persecution of all who dissent in the least degree from the magistrate's religion.

For be it observed, to the honour and credit of these elder brethren of our modern church politicians, that they argued consistently, and consequentially from their thesis, against any degree of toleration of any sect or religious society, which should dissent from the magistrate's establishment.

Whereas the advocate of the present times, who treads so carefully in their steps, in conferring the unlimited controul of religion upon the civil magistrate, pleads also, most absurdly and inconsistently, for an universal toleration, to the utter subversion of his whole fabric, and without having the least foresight, as it should seem, that the same evils would arise to the state by tolerating, as by supporting the religious sects and societies which dissent, either from the forms of faith and doctrine, or the

may misunderstand the magistrate's opinions, and a *knave* may pervert them and prevaricate. The magistrate therefore will want farther evidence, viz. that there is neither a *fool* nor a *knave* among his subscribers; and how he will come at this evidence, it is not possible to conceive, unless this advocate for his power can help him out. But this advocate is indeed but an inferior hand at finding out evidence of men's opinions: a Spanish inquisitor would do it in half the time, and with half the trouble.

models of worship established by the civil magistrate.*

Toleration of dissenters from the public religious establishment, whose tenets are neither professedly, nor by implication, inimical to the civil government, is very plainly deduced from the principles of the christian religion, which takes the judgment of private conscience out of the hands of human power, and postpones it to the awful day when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed. Upon these principles it is founded by the express declaration of our own protestant establishment; and consequently is totally inconsistent with the unlimited power of establishing what religion he thinks fit, vested in the civil magistrate by this modern politician. With this power in his hands, conferred with the circumstances, and for the purposes mentioned by this writer, he can in no degree permit the public profession of any religion different from that of his own establishment, without bringing upon himself, either the imputation of being unfaithful to his trust, or the suspicion of a consciousness, that his unlimited power of establishing his own religion is a mere pretence, and the exercise of it a mere usurpation. If the right of the dissenter to enjoy his own modes of faith and worship without molestation, is derived from the sovereignty of Christ over those who profess his religion, the same

* See *The plea of the petitioners ſtated and vindicated from the miſrepreſentations in a late charge delivered by Dr. Balguy to the clergy of the archdeaconry of Wincheſter, printed for Payne, Hingeſton, and Wilkie*, 1773. p. 46. A moſt maſterly performance, to which no anſwer has been or can be given.

rule by which he is understood to prescribe such toleration, must operate upon the christian magistrate in settling the terms of a righteous establishment.

I forbear to apply the foregoing considerations to the case of the petitioners of last year. The defence of their proceedings seems to arise so immediately from the nature and genius of our happy constitution, that I have not yet seen any thing laid to their charge, which did not include either an open or tacit reflection upon the original and fundamental principles on which our reformation from popery, and the protestant settlement of our civil government in 1688, have been so ably defended by our most distinguished patriots, both in former and more modern times.

The petitioners are, in the mean time, very ably to defend themselves, and have done it, I trust, to the satisfaction of every sensible man, who wishes to see an increase of christian piety and christian edification take place of those unprofitable disputes on points of systematical theology, from which no religious improvement is to be had for those, among whom it is for the peace and safety of our righteous government, that the influence of pure unadulterated christianity should chiefly flourish and abound.*

* An unknown hand hath, with great impartiality, given the public a list of the pamphlets published on both sides of the controversy concerning subscriptions for several years by past, with their several dates, and also information where they may be had. It is indeed a controversy highly interesting to serious christians of all

Let me add to this, that where a society of worthy and well-meaning men, some of whom at least have been as eminently useful to the public in their stations, as most of their adversaries, are publicly misrepresented and even calumniated, I do not know why any honest man in any situation, public or private, should be afraid or ashamed of rescuing their characters from the false and malevolent imputations of a sort of opponents, who are far from satisfying the public that they enter into the controversy with the *sole* desire of finding the truth.

I do not indeed see the propriety or the pertinence of bringing the petitioners into a dispute, concerning the authority of the civil magistrate in matters of religion. If the petitioners are wrong, it is not because they have declined to submit their cause to the civil powers; for to the civil powers their application for relief was made. And however exceptionable their cause may prove to be upon the merits of it, they might surely be opposed, so far as their request is improper and inadmissible, upon principles less destructive of our protestant establishment.

Let us not then give up the inestimable privileges we enjoy under it, for the sake of dis-

ranks. By this enumeration it will he eafily perceived that the petitioners defire that the whole caufe may be openly and candidly referred to the uubiaſſed examination of the public, and judgment given according to the merits. The title of this little piece is, *A ſhort View of the Controverſy occaſioned by the Confeſſional, and the Petition to Parliament for Relief in the Matter of Subſcription to the Liturgy, and XXXIX Articles of the church of England. London, printed for J. Johnſon, No. 72, St. Paul's Churchyard*, 1773.

appointing a body of men who appear to wish as well to it as ourselves. Let us not sacrifice our dearest interests, both as christian ministers and the subjects of a free protestant state, to an impotent resentment against a number of our brethren, who, if they have offended at all, have offended by endeavouring to add, in their own apprehension at least, a farther degree of strength, security, and union, to the common cause, in which all of us, as faithful ministers of the word of God, should be cordially and conscientiously engaged.

FINIS.

[*Printed by B. Flower, Cambridge.*]

A

DISCOURSE

ON THE

STUDY

OF THE

SCRIPTURES.

Delivered to the

CLERGY

OF THE

Archdeaconry of *CLEVELAND,*

At the Visitation held in the Year 1763.

[FIRST PRINTED MDCCLXIII.]

A DISCOURSE, &c.

Reverend Brethren,

HAVING no present occasion to enter into any subject of external order or discipline, otherwise than in the common forms of inquiry, I would chuse to employ the time usually allotted for that kind of exhortation, in turning our mutual attention to something more immediately conducive to the important ends of our calling, and particularly to a branch of our duty, in which the exigencies of the present state of religion among us, seem to require we should exert our utmost diligence nnd capacity ; I mean the study of the holy scriptures.

There have been, in my apprehension, very few periods of time since the reformation, wherein it was more necessary for those who have undertaken the office of public ministers, to cultivate scriptural learning, and to labour to acquire a right understanding of the sacred oracles, than the present, when so many teachers are daily arising, pretending to extraordinary gifts, and endeavouring to instill into the

minds of the people, a variety of uncommon notions, with the utmost eagerness and industry, and who may be justly suspected to owe their success, not so much to any solid demonstration of the truth of what they have to say, as to their vehemence in delivering it, and the warm concern they express for the spiritual welfare of their hearers.

I see not why this may not be allowed, in many cases, to be the effects of an honest zeal. But the apostle Paul hath informed us, there may be *a zeal without knowledge**, which, it should seem from his manner of introducing the remark, he did not mean to commend. To distinguish this from a better sort of it, the same apostle exhorts to *prove* and *try* all popular doctrines, by bringing them to the test of the *wholesome* [or healing] *words of our Lord Jesus Christ.*† And this is likewise injoyned by St. John, by whatever spirit the teachers of such doctrines pretend to be directed.†

These *wholesome words* we have in the scriptures, and it would be in vain to look for them in any other repository. But the scriptures, being written originally in languages not perfectly attainable without much application, and frequently referring to customs and incidents, some of which are but imperfectly explained by the remains we have of antiquity, and not at all by any thing within our experience, must of course be liable to be misinterpreted by the unlearned and unskilful, and, in innumerable in-

* Rom. x. 2.

† 1. Tim. vi. 3. Ὑγιαινουσι Λογοις

† 1 John iv. 1.

stances, to have senses put upon them, which the writers never thought of.

You may indeed, if you please, contradict these senses, and confront them with the received opinions of the system you profess: but this will go but a little way towards the satisfaction of those who are waiting for a solid decision of the points in debate, and who, for that purpose, desire to have things examined to the bottom. The questions will always be returning upon you, "Are you sure the public system is right? What security have you that the compilers of it might not be as liable to mistake the sense of scripture, as some of these private interpreters?" And where such questions are asked, a disputant will make but an indifferent figure, who having expressed his aversion and indignation against any particular doctrine, appears to be ignorant of the principles on which it is espoused, and probably to have no better foundation for his own faith, than the authority of his superiors.

In protestant countries, where the scriptures alone are acknowledged to be the standard of true religion, every teacher, who desires to be heard with patience and attention, must appeal to them. And this we find popular teachers of all denominations but *one*, do very boldly, and with all seeming deference to their authority. It is not supposeable that such teachers should be wrong in every thing they advance, merely because they differ from the received doctrines of a public establishment: a supposition of that sort can only be the effect of a weak and idle prejudice. Candid and capable judges

will not scruple to own, that many writers, both of former and latter times, sufficiently censureable in some respects, have delivered many important truths supported by the clearest evidence, and the soundest interpretation of scripture.

On the other hand, there is no depending upon every thing a teacher by public appointment advances, on the mere presumption of the orthodoxy of the system to which he adheres. No church has, nor does any protestant church pretend to have, the power of prescribing forms and confessions of faith to another church; nor even to the members of it's own communion, farther than such forms are proved to be in perfect agreement with the word of God. THAT is the common measure for all. And if a man has no skill in the sort of test by which all doctrines ought to be tried, he can never properly support or defend what he teaches or professes, either as a member of the established church, or as the leader of a separate congregation.

The case standing thus, and so large a majority of our common people wanting both the leisure and the requisite means to go through an accurate examination of the scriptures, the duty of instructing them lies with the greater weight upon their appointed pastors. And surely great reason have they to expect it should be faithfully and skilfully discharged. They have a demand upon our office and character that we should be qualified and prepared, upon all occasions, to satisfy their scruples, and to furnish them with proper answers to every one who

ssketh a reason of the hope that is in them, or who pretends to give them a different account from that they have received, either of the hope itself, or of the grounds and reasons on which it should be entertained.

It may now be demanded,—What is the criterion of a just and solid interpretation of scripture? By what methods of study is it to be sought? And by what marks and characters may it be known? It is notorious that commentators even of the first reputation, are of different complexions in this province of interpreting scripture; and often give different, not to say contradictory explanations of the very same passages, as they are respectively influenced by a variety of considerations. This indeed happens most frequently, in cases of inferior importance. But still it does happen; and cases are of more or less importance, just as the people with whom we have to do, are more or less affected by them. It is therefore highly expedient that we should have some such rules or directions, in a matter of this consequence, as may preserve us at least from any frequent and pernicious deviations from the mind of *Christ*, or of those who have delivered his doctrine under his more immediate commission.

As such rules of interpretation must have respect to a variety of circumstances, which occasion doubts and difficulties in the study of the scriptures, it will not be expected that I should enter into so large a field of disquisition on the present occasion, as would take in every case that might be stated; or even enumerate

those general rules, the observation of which seems to be indispensable to every searcher of the scriptures in the original languages.* My purpose is only to offer a few general hints of more especial importance with respect to our present exigencies; beginning with some remarks on one or two methods of interpreting scripture, which, after having been long exploded by all sensible and sober writers, seem to be once more recovering their reputation among our common people, by the efforts of a sort of teachers of more zeal than discretion.

* There is a sensible summary of these rules at the end of Wetstein's second volume of his Greek Testament, with some curious observations from Castalio's papers on the subject. They who think Wetstein's rules and remarks short or insufficient, may collect many useful and just observations from Castalio's dispute with Beza and others which deserves to be more known and read; from Simon's critical histories of the Old and New Testaments, and the tracts occasioned by those histories, particularly Le Clerc's *Sentimens de quelques Theologiens*, &c. from the same Le Clerc's *second Dissertation* prefixed to his Commentary on the Pentateuch, and other pieces of that judicious and industrious writer. There is likewise much to be learned from the controversy of the French Jansenists with the critics on the version of *Mons*. I mention these foreigners rather than the eminent critics of our own country, because, having entire translations either to defend or to censure, they enter into the subject of scriptural interpretation with more compass and precision than our English divines, few or none of whom, of any tolerable abilities, have attempted an entire new version either of the Old or New Testament; and whose critical remarks, in reference to particular passages, are more detached from the general subject. I mean not by this to allow, that the labours of the learned of any country have contributed more to the improvement of sacred literature than those of our own. What our English critics have done in this way, all the world knows, and has done justice to their merit. What they are still doing, appears by Mr. Bowyer's late accurate edition of the Greek Testament, and the learned preface and emendations with which it is enriched.

1. They who are conversant in the history of the protestant reformation, know very well that the church of Rome, so long as she was allowed to keep the interpretation of the scriptures in her own hands, had no objection to have all controversies decided by them. The method she chiefly depended upon, was the ALLEGORICAL, by means whereof the power of the Pope, his absolute sovereignty over the whole christian church, and every circumstance of superstition and tyranny of which that was the parent, were, without much difficulty, derived from, or made to correspond to, something in the history of the patriarchs, kings and prophets in the Old Testament, or of the apostles and others in the gospel history.

It must be acknowledged that the papists had too many precedents for this practice in the writings of the fathers, particularly Origen and Jerom, and other early christian writers who had been educated among the Jews in the scholastic literature of Alexandria.

Martin Luther's conflicts with popery, led him, very soon to an accurate examination of these allegorical interpretations; the danger and futility of which he exposed with great spirit and good sense; shewing, in some remarkable instances, their tendency to fix the grossest absurdities on the word of God. And he observes that Jerom himself, though extravagantly guilty of allegorizing, complained of the same abuses in his time.*

* See Seckendorf's history of Lutheranism, B. ii. p. 24. It should not however be concealed that Luther himself gave into this

Henceforward this truly great man set himself to expound the word of God according to *the literal sense*, and *the scope* and *coherence of the context;* earnestly exhorting his followers, "to make *these* their objects in searching "the scriptures, as the only solid foundation "of their faith, and the only source of conso-"lation in their spiritual warfare." By this method he and his coadjutors were enabled, not only to expose the nakedness of popery, but to confute the enthusiastic dreams of those fanatics, who, under the pretence of new lights and inspirations, ran into a thousand licentious enormities, to the great grief and scandal of the original reformers, as well as the great disturbance of the public peace. And the people being put into the same rational method by Luther's translation and comments in the vulgar tongue, became competent judges of the sense of the scriptures, read them with understanding and edification, and came over from popery in incredible numbers.

way of allegorizing ſcripture on ſome occaſions, and even in this very work (his Commentary on Deuteronomy) in which he cenſures the fathers and popiſh writers for it ſo ſeverely. Seckendorf, in the paſſage above referred to, apologizes for him thus: *Indulſit aliquando in hac explicatione allegoriis, in gratiam auditorum; ſed ut abusum caveret, graviſſimam adhortationem præmiſit ſub finem capitis primi;* which the hiſtorian immediately puts down. From whence it appears that allegorizing in general, in Luther's opinion, when not in the hands of inſpired writers, is little better than an abuſe of ſcripture. How far Luther may be excuſeable for deviating from his own plan to humour the vitiated taſte of his audience, muſt be determined by the caſuiſts. But it were to be wiſhed that every one who conceives himſelf to be under the ſame neceſſity of writing to the taſte of the public, would be equally ingenuous in cenſuring his own infirmity.

The popish churchmen were too much interested in the event of these alterations, not to endeavour to support themselves and their sinking cause, by trying what the same popular methods of interpretation would do for them. What their success was, the following reflections of an excellent writer inform us.

" When Cardinal Cajetan, in the days of " our grandfathers, had forsaken that vein of " postilling and allegorizing on scripture, " which for a long time had prevailed in the " church, and betaken himself unto the literal " sense, it was a thing so distasteful unto the " church of Rome, that he was forced to find " out many shifts, and make many apologies " for himself. The truth is (as it will appear " to him that reads his writings) this sticking " close to the literal sense, was that alone " which made him shake many of those tenets, " upon which the church of Rome and the re- " formed churches differ. But when the im- " portunity of the reformers, and the great " credit of Calvin's writings in that kind, had " forced the divines of Rome to level their in- " terpretations by the same line; when they saw " that no pains, no subtlety of wit was strong " enough to defeat the evidence of scripture, " it drave them on those desperate shelves on " which at this day they stick, to call in " question, as far as they durst, the credit of " the *Hebrew* text, and countenance against " it a corrupt translation [the *Latin Vulgate*] " to add traditions unto scripture, and to " make the churches interpretation so pretend-

" ed, to be above exception."* That is, in plain terms, to make new scriptures, which might serve their turn better than the old ones.

This method of turning scripture into allegory, having been exploded by all sober protestants for these weighty reasons, one would hope no serious man, who is desirous of learning the genuine sense of his master's will, would wish to see it revived, or would be in any danger of being led away by those, who endeavour to impose their precarious flights and conjectures of this kind on their simple minded followers, as the incontestable dictates of the spirit of truth and purity.

2. Nearly allied to this is another weak and fanciful manner of expounding scripture; called the *mystical*, which, as well as the *allegorical*, is derived from the *Cabbala* of the *Jews*,† and, among the modern visionaries of that cast, consists in seeking mysterious and spiritual meanings in the most ordinary incidents mentioned in the Bible, and even in clauses and single words, totally detached from their connexion with the context.

Should you remonstrate to this class of interpreters, that no such senses arise from the plain construction of the words or passages in question, and that neither the genius of the language, nor the design of the sacred writer will admit of them; you are immediately answered, " That the knowledge of the scriptures does

* Hales's Golden Remains, 1673, p. 19.

† Concerning the rise and cultivation of the *Jewish Cabbala*, its introduction into Christian theology, and its prenicious effects, see Mr. Basnage's history of the Jews, B. iii. chap. 10.—30.

not depend upon the construction of languages, or the reasoning and scope of the context, but upon the motions and suggestions of the spirit." On such occasions these gifted interpreters alledge *that the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life;** wresting thus what was said by St. Paul of the carnal ordinances of the Mosaic law literally taken, and without their relation to Christ, to the plainest of our Saviour's doctrines and precepts; supposing these to be incumbered with a veil just as impenetrable to common christians, as that of the ceremonial institute was to the Jews. What is this but rendering the study of the scriptures a vain employment to all who are not conscious of the same degree of illumination these persons pretend to? And who sees not that, under these pretences, as many new and different gospels may be preached, as there are men to be found

* 2 Cor. iii. 6. Mr. John Wesley (whom however I mean not to charge with the folly and extravagance of some who are called by his name) thus comments upon these words: "Yea, if we adhere "to the literal sense even of the *moral* law, if we regard only the "precept and the sanction as they stand *in themselves, not as they* "*lead us to Christ*, they are, doubtless, a *killing* ordinance, and bind "us down under the sentence of death." Had he said, *not as they lead us to the love of our neighbour*, we should have understood him, in agreement with the apostle, Rom. xiii. 8, 9, 10. But this would have been nothing to the purpose of the text upon which he was commenting. Whereas, by saying, *not as leading us to Christ*, he must mean, if he has any meaning, that the *moral* and *ceremonial* law had *both* the same sort of *typical* or *mystical* signification in reference to *Christ*. The inevitable consequence of which is, that *both* are only *shadows of good things to come*, that *both* are *abolished* in *Christ*, and that *neither* of them are of any obligation under the Christian covenant: which he would do well to reconcile with our Saviour's inforcing the *moral* law so frequently and so earnestly in its most obvious literal sense

who can persuade themselves that they partake of this inlightening spirit.*

It is by no means unaccountable that this kind of exposition, should make sudden and strong impressions on the minds of the common people. To have the abstrusest parts of the sacred writings made familiar to them by allusions and applications to the most vulgar incidents and ideas, affords an agreeable entertainment to their imaginations; whilst, on another hand, their vanity is flattered by being let into secrets and mysteries, reserved for the edification of their own fraternity, to the exclusion of all others. This passes of course for a distinguishing mark of the divine favour, and seldom fails of producing greater or less degrees of spiritual pride. With these supposed privileges in their possession, it is not likely they should think of employing their common sense to examine whether the doctrines they espouse, in consequence of these interpretations, have any competent evidence, or any solid foundation in the scriptures; or whether they do not rather tend to disparage the dignity of the word of God, and to throw the christian revelation once more into darkness and barbarism. What, I am afraid, may too often farther contribute to the difficulty of undeceiving them, is, that probably such as these may be the first religious impressions they have ever received. The fatal neglect of the religious education of young peo-

* With what *equal* success the cabbalistical method of interpretation has been employed both *for* and *against* Christianity, may be seen in the *Nizzachon vetus*, published by *Wagenseil*, in the 2d vol. of his *Tela ignea Satanæ*.

ple of all classes, and the slight and superficial manner in which they are usually instructed in the principles of christianity, is too notorious to be dissembled. Hence those of a serious turn, or weak spirits, become susceptible of the first religious notions that occur, by whomsoever suggested,* and exposed to the delusions of pragmatical pretenders of all denominations. Whereas were good foundations laid in due season, they would learn, by a gradual progress in knowledge and practical experience, that the doctrines and precepts of our blessed Saviour, in their native and amiable simplicity, are abundantly sufficient for all the purposes of faith in the promises, and obedience to the will of God in Christ; and much more likely to be efficacious to salvation upon the humble and contrite spirit, than the flighty strains of those who affect to be wise above what is written. These, while they warm and exalt the fancy, too commonly leave the heart *barren* and *unfruitful* in those moral dispositions, which the discipline of the gospel has so plain a tendency to promote and improve.

The time will not permit me to enlarge upon those correctives of this enthusiastic spirit, to which it may be necessary for us to have recourse on various occasions. What is most expedient in this behalf will, I doubt not, my reverend brethren, be suggested to your prudence, by the nature of the several cases which

* The late Sir *T——s B——t* being asked his opinion of the Methodists, answered, after a short pause, "It has ever been the humour of the common people of Britain, if they have not the gospel preached to them, to preach it to themselves."

fall within your cognizance, and call for your interposition. What now remains, is only to mention a few of the most important and indispensable preparatives for the province of instructing the ignorant, supporting the weak, and bringing back those who are out of the way, by a proper application of the word of God.

1. The first of these is a careful study of the scriptures in the original languages in which they were written. It is to be pre-supposed that every one, who aspires to the vocation of a christian teacher, has laid in a competent measure of the learning necessary for this purpose, in the progress of his education. Be that as it may, it is certain the pursuit and cultivation of it, in the course of our calling, will admit of no intermission, if we mean to make *full proof of our ministry.* The sacred oracles contain a fund of knowledge, an inexhaustible treasure of wisdom and truth, for some portions of which we shall have daily demands to the latest period of our lives. But of what use will all all this be to any man who has not the *key*, and is thus excluded from availing himself of these stores, upon the various occasions which call for the immediate employment of them?

You will say, he may borrow what is sufficient for him from linguists and interpreters, who offer themselves in great plenty, to assist and inform those who are deficient in this sort of qualification. This reminds me just to mention the great numbers of annotations and commentaries on the scriptures, which have been published of late years, beyond the example of former times. What these may do for the edi-

fication of the people, I shall not say. But I apprehend they will hardly permit the faithful dispenser of the word to be less diligent and accurate in his endeavours to find out the true sense of the sacred text than heretofore. One cannot presume much beforehand, in favour of such of these compilations as are published with a merely lucrative view, as many of them certainly are. Perhaps the greater part of them would hardly stand the test of an intimate examination. Many of them follow the common track, without the least conception whether it be right or wrong, often repeating, in their own terms, what has been much better expressed before. Marks of haste, and a superficial acquaintance with their subject; and an attachment to current systems, are common to most of them: and the few who leave the beaten road, are too apt to follow those who deal in paradoxes and ill-grounded conjectures, who, of all others, are least fit to be trusted in this province, having previously espoused some hypothesis of their own, to which they are for making all things bend. And if to these observations we add the difference that is often found among commentators of superior classes and abilities, a conscientious clergyman will hardly be able to make himself easy without going to the fountain head, and employing his own eyes and understanding in a disquisition where it is of so much consequence, both to himself and his flock, that he should not be misled or imposed upon.

I have the charity to believe, that if many of those superficial and illiterate men, who set

cal obedience from all share in the justification of man.* But,

3. That which will give the diligent and sensible reader the clearest conception and the most comprehensive view of the sense of scripture, is an attentive regard to the WHOLE of God's dispensation, from the fall of Man, to the accomplishment of his restoration in Christ. That is to say, a regard to the connexion and dependence of one part of this amazing plan with another ;—how particular institutions are adapted and varied according to the state of mankind at different periods of time ;—by what gradual revelations, and seasonable deduction the people of God were instructed, to what end and consummation divine providence was leading them, by so many miraculous interpositions in favour of them and their forefathers ;—how their condition was affected by such alterations in their policy and manners, as were either common to them with all other nations, or peculiar to their own particular genius and temper ;—how their prejudices shifted from a violent propensity to an unlawful

* It is however for the honour of our first reformers to observe, that St. Paul's argument was urged home by them to the papists, with the utmost propriety. *Ecclesiastical* works, *under any system*, have no more to do with justification in *Christ*, than the works of the *Jewish* ritual. Even *alms*, *prayers*, &c. when performed by number, measure, and rule, in order to escape *purgatories* of different kinds, and by way of *penance*, *atonement*, and the like, degenerate into mere idle ceremonies, and are to be valued accordingly. And such were all the good works, of any reputation, in the church of Rome, at the time of the reformation : and such it should seem, they still continue to be ; as their modern manuals still reckon both *sins* and *good works* by *sevens*. The SEVEN *deadly* sins, the SEVEN works of *Charity*, &c.

commerce with their Gentile neighbours, to as violent an attachment to their own law ;—and how wisely the prophetic messages were suited to these several incidental changes. By these means we shall find many things, which, as they stand alone, are obscure and unaccountable, cleared up, and rendered perfectly consistent by subsequent events and providences ; and shall perceive the whole co-operating by a disposition and harmony (inconceivable to those who only read and contemplate upon detached parts of scripture) towards the completion of one grand design,—the meliorating the corruption of human nature, and providing in the best and wisest manner for the eternal happiness of the human race.

They who read the bible with this compass of reflection, will find, that, after all the most able and ingenious commentators have done, the scriptures are the best explainers of themselves,* and that they seldom fail, in some pas-

* Fallitur quiſquis aliunde Chriſtianiſmi formam petit quam e ſcriptura canonica. Quantum enim ab hujus puritate abſunt commentarii ? In hac nihil reperias non auguſtum ; in illis quam multa quæ a philoſophia, ab humanæ rationis æſtimatione pendent, quæ cum judicio ſpiritus prorſus ex diametro pugnant.—Ex *Origene* ſi tollas inconcinnas allegorias, et philoſophicarum ſententiarum ſylvam, quantulum erit reliquum ? Et tamen hunc autorem magno concenſu ſequuntur *Græci*, et ex *Latinis*, qui videntur eſſe columnæ, *Ambroſius* et *Hieronymus*. Poſt hos fere, quo quiſque recentior eſt, eo eſt inſincerior ; degeneravitque tandem diſciplina Chriſtiana in ſcholaſticas nugas, de quibus dubites, impiæ magis ſint an ſtultæ. Breviter, fieri nequit, quin cauto etiam lectori ſæpe imponant humana ſcripta. MELANCTHON. *Loc. Com.*—Had this excellent man lived to theſe days, he would have owned that commentators have ſucceeded theſe, of a better complexion. But his cautions are not unſeaſonable even for the preſent times.

cal obedience from all share in the justification of man.* But,

3. That which will give the diligent and sensible reader the clearest conception and the most comprehensive view of the sense of scripture, is an attentive regard to the WHOLE of God's dispensation, from the fall of Man, to the accomplishment of his restoration in Christ. That is to say, a regard to the connexion and dependence of one part of this amazing plan with another ;—how particular institutions are adapted and varied according to the state of mankind at different periods of time ;—by what gradual revelations, and seasonable deduction the people of God were instructed, to what end and consummation divine providence was leading them, by so many miraculous interpositions in favour of them and their forefathers ;—how their condition was affected by such alterations in their policy and manners, as were either common to them with all other nations, or peculiar to their own particular genius and temper ;—how their prejudices shifted from a violent propensity to an unlawful

* It is however for the honour of our first reformers to observe, that St. Paul's argument was urged home by them to the papists, with the utmost propriety. *Ecclesiastical* works, *under any system*, have no more to do with justification in *Christ*, than the works of the *Jewish* ritual. Even *alms*, *prayers*, &c. when performed by number, measure, and rule, in order to escape *purgatories* of different kinds, and by way of *penance*, *atonement*, and the like, degenerate into mere idle ceremonies, and are to be valued accordingly. And such were all the good works, of any reputation, in the church of Rome, at the time of the reformation : and such it should seem, they still continue to be ; as their modern manuals still reckon both *sins* and *good works* by *sevens*. The SEVEN *deadly* sins, the SEVEN works of *Charity*, &c.

commerce with their Gentile neighbours, to as violent an attachment to their own law ;—and how wisely the prophetic messages were suited to these several incidental changes. By these means we shall find many things, which, as they stand alone, are obscure and unaccountable, cleared up, and rendered perfectly consistent by subsequent events and providences; and shall perceive the whole co-operating by a disposition and harmony (inconceiveable to those who only read and contemplate upon detached parts of scripture) towards the completion of one grand design,—the meliorating the corruption of human nature, and providing in the best and wisest manner for the eternal happiness of the human race.

They who read the bible with this compass of reflection, will find, that, after all the most able and ingenious commentators have done, the scriptures are the best explainers of themselves,* and that they seldom fail, in some pas-

* Fallitur quisquis aliunde Christianismi formam petit quam e scriptura canonica. Quantum enim ab hujus puritate absunt commentarii? In hac nihil reperias non augustum ; in illis quam multa quæ a philosophia, ab humanæ rationis æstimatione pendent, quæ cum judicio spiritus prorsus ex diametro pugnant.—Ex *Origene* si tollas inconcinnas allegorias, et philosophicarum sententiarum sylvam, quantulum erit reliquum? Et tamen hunc autorem magno concensu sequuntur *Græci*, et ex *Latinis*, qui videntur esse columnæ, *Ambrosius* et *Hieronymus*. Post hos fere, quo quisque recentior est, eo est insincerior ; degeneravitque tandem disciplina Christiana in scholasticas nugas, de quibus dubites, impiæ magis sint an stultæ. Breviter, fieri nequit, quin cauto etiam lectori sæpe imponant humana scripta. MELANCTHON. *Loc. Com.*—Had this excellent man lived to these days, he would have owned that commentators have succeded these, of a better complexion. But his cautions are not unseasonable even for the present times.

sages, to clear up or account for what may appear difficult, dark, and embarrassed in others. One may venture to promise that, by this comprehensive attention, a fund of scriptural knowledge may be acquired by those who understand only their mother tongue, to a degree which would exceed the proficiency even of scholars, who either confine their studies and inquiries to particular books or portions of holy writ, or extend them farther without considering the times and characters to which particular revelations are adapted, and the relation they have to others which preceded them, or were to follow them. Our translation, it is true, is faulty in many respects, and seems to call upon those in authority for a careful and accurate revision : but, with all its faults, it leaves the scope and progression of the Creator's grand dispensation sufficiently discernible and coherent to a diligent and capable reader, even without those helps which have been added from the revival and improvement of sound literature since the beginning of the fifteenth century.

4. There still remains to be mentioned, my Reverend Brethren, another sort of preparation, equally indispensable with any other, towards a right understanding of the word of God, namely, the preparation of the *heart ;* an earnest desire to learn the will of God, as well for the guidance and direction of our own conversation, as for the information of others. Sincerity, an humble and docible spirit, and a love of truth, are necessary preparatives for our own proficiency ; and to communicate what we thus

learn with a proper effect, our warmest affections should be interested for the present and future welfare of those to whom we stand in the relation of pastors and teachers. Our instructions should be given with a freedom and singleness of heart, evidencing our entire conviction, in the first place, of the truth and importance of what we have to deliver, and afterwards our total detachment from all views of filthy lucre and vain glory, and from every taint of partiality and hypocrisy. What wonder the sacred oracles should be obscure, difficult, and unintelligible to him, whose mind is unimpressed with a sense of heavenly things? Or what fruit can we expect should be brought forth by a people who are led, by the indolence and indifference of their pastors, to conceive that the care of their future happiness may well be postponed to the cultivation of their interests in the present life? In the midst, indeed, of the various infirmities, temptations, and delusions with which we are all of us beset, there is no keeping up the seriousness and recollection requisite to the due discharge of our pastoral obligations, without the aid of that good spirit of God, which is distinguished from all other spirits by the gracious characters of truth, purity, peace, and love. Here must be our refuge, and from hence must we look for light and consolation in all our doubts and obscurities, for strength in all our weaknesses, and support in all our conflicts. The prayer of the Psalmist, *Open thou mine eyes, that I may see the wonderous things of thy law*, should be ever in our hearts, when the scriptures are in our hands.*

* Psalm cxix. 18.

The apostle *Paul* makes it a part of his earnest prayers to God that the *understanding* of those to whom he wrote his epistles might be *enlightened*, that they *might be able to comprehend* the full compass and extent *of the love of God in* Christ, *the hope of his calling, the riches of his inheritance, and the exceeding greatness of his power towards them that believe.** As if he had been sensible that, without such vouchsafement, his own incessant labours, added to his consummate abilities, would be in vain. How much more necessary must the like supplications be for us, to whom the ministration of the word is committed under so many disadvantages, and who have not only our own private occasions to supply, but a sufficient fund to provide for the necessities of those under our care, whose capacities and dispositions require edification with an almost infinite variety of circumstances?

But after all, as the gifts and talents of mankind infinitely vary, and as different men may take equal pains with very unequal portions of natural apprehension and sagacity, and consequently with very unequal improvement and success, the surest way of deriving a blessing upon our labours, is to shew, by our own practice, that we are under the conviction and influence of our own knowledge and principles. A holy life and conversation, the fruits of an honest and good heart, will oftentimes *adorn* doctrines which would by no means stand the test, either of scripture or sound reason, were

* Ephes. i. 16, 19, and iii. 14, 19. Compare also Col. i. 9.

they to be examined by the rigid rules of accurate learning and criticism. There are pious and virtuous souls of all sects and parties, whose examples are without blemish, from which more edification will certainly arise to a majority of those who are in the class of hearers, than would, in any case, from the most curious detail of rules and principles, that should want that kind of illustration. There is indeed a presumption beforehand, that he who does not make the word of God *a lantern unto his feet, and a light unto his paths*, will never be able to hold forth any genuine explanation of it for the benefit of others. Some indeed have been known to be very able and intelligent teachers of others, who have had all the *outward* tokens, at least, of being reprobates themselves; but such instances are rare; and few will think of profiting by documents which appear to make no manner of impression upon the man who delivers them. It is indeed hard to conceive, that he who is conscious of his counteracting the will of his master in the general tenor of his own conversation, should have either the honesty or the assurance to press the strict observation of christian purity, and christian obedience, upon his fellow-servants.

This case is bad enough. But there is another still worse. Profligacy, I trust, is the characteristic of very few of the clergy. It is more generally laid to our account, that (with more decent appearances indeed) we betray a greater attachment to secular pursuits and gra-

tifications, than is consistent either with the nature, the design, or the proper occupations of our function. The real disparagement this brings upon religion in general, and our own profession in particular, is, I am afraid, the less understood, upon account of the indulgence and incouragement this kind of motley character finds with the *fashionable* public. It is, however, a very serious question, "Is such conformity to the world, in men who have taken upon them to *do the work of Evangelists*, agreeable to the nature of that trust upon the terms of the gospel, or even to the stipulations they make with the church by which they are sent out?" A plain state of the case, and the plain sense of the commandment declare it is not. But when men have the double temptation before them, of gratifying their passions, and of supporting their estimation by a *seeming* consistency of character, how natural is it for them to warp and wrest the strict precepts of the gospel, to some specious agreement with the loose morality exemplified in their worldly conduct. How necessary, to excuse the licentiousness of their patrons and abettors, by the same sort of casuistry, which they suppose will justify themselves? Is there not room for more than a suspicion that this is too frequently done? Is it not done in many popular discourses every day, which receive their applause from no greater merit, than a certain dexterity in accommodating the maxims of Christanity to the taste and sentiments of the dissipated and artificial leaders of public fashion? Sure I am, it is safer to commit a

simple-minded people to an immoral teacher, who fairly and openly contrasts his own irregularities with the plain undisguised word of God, than to hypocrites and sycophants, who so basely corrupt the fountains of truth, and lull themselves and others into so fatal a lethargy. There is no great hazard in saying that the mischief that is done, and the obstruction that is given to the influence of christianity, even by the illiterate visionaries of these times, is much less than what is occasioned by *handling the word of God deceitfully.* Enthusiasts may be ignorant, they may be extravagant and widely mistaken: but they may be honest, and zealously affected for the glory of God, and the good of men's souls; and while that is the case, there is no reason to fear they will give any man room to hope that he will be accepted by God as a good christian, who leads the life of an unbelieving *pagan.* In one word, my Reverend Brethren, whatever colours may be put upon the practice I am now censuring, by those who, for divers reasons, love to have religion so represented, I am sure you will agree with me, that the great importance of our calling, and the pressing obligations that we should be faithful in discharging the duties of it, leave no room to doubt, but a severe *wo* will be the portion of those by whom such offences come.

FINIS.

[*B. Flower, Cambridge.*]

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01086 1963

DATE DUE

AUG 2 5 1995			

Printed in USA

HIGHSMITH #45230